

den, Craig, Aspen, Breckenridge, Basalt, New Castle, Silt, Eagle, Redcliff, Minturn, Fruita, Carbondale, Grand Valley, Clifton, De Beque, Rifle, and Olathe, in the fourth congressional district of Colorado, in support of the measure to tax interstate mail-order business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Forsythe Dyeing Co., of New Haven, Conn., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Joseph A. Parker & Sons Co., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: Petition of Coral Manufacturing Co., of Norristown, Pa., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, January 20, 1916.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we seek Thy favor and grace and guidance for the duties of this new day. Our duties are ever increasing; our responsibilities are more and more with every coming day. By Thy grace we have erected a great empire and by Thy grace alone shall we be enabled to project the policies which carry out the plans and secure the permanency of our Nation's life, and the development of all its resources. Grant us Thy guidance and blessing as Thou hast given Thy guidance and blessing to the fathers. We ask for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

REFUNDS OF DRAWBACKS (S. DOC. NO. 248).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, which will be read.

The communication was read and ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 18, 1916.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE.

Sir: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of a copy of the Senate resolution, dated the 10th instant, directing me to submit to the Senate a statement showing certain data relative to applications for, and payment of, drawbacks under paragraph O, Section IV, of the present tariff act, for various periods.

In reply I have to state that instructions have been given to various collectors of customs to forward the required data to the department, where it will be compiled and submitted to the Senate with the least possible delay. I may add that the clerical labor involved, requiring as it does reference to every drawback transaction in the Customs Service for a period of two and a half years, will consume considerable time, but that the same will be expedited in every possible way.

Respectfully,

W. G. McAdoo, Secretary.

WATER-POWER SITES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, January 17, 1916.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

Sir: In accordance with the provisions of Senate resolution No. 544, passed by the Sixty-third Congress, third session, I have the honor to transmit herewith the information in my possession as to the ownership and control of the water-power sites in the United States; showing what proportion of such water-power sites is in private ownership and by what companies and corporations such sites in private ownership are owned and controlled; what horsepower has been developed and what proportion of it is owned and controlled by such private companies and corporations; and facts bearing upon the question as to the existence of a monopoly in the ownership and control of hydroelectric power in the United States.

Respectfully,

D. F. Houston, Secretary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not know what to do with the accompanying papers.

Mr. MYERS. I ask that the matter be printed as a public document. It contains valuable information.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Here it is [indicating].

Mr. MYERS. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Printing, then.

Mr. OVERMAN. It seems to me that as the question is being dealt with by the Committee on Commerce it ought to go to that committee.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. OVERMAN. The question of constitutionality is being considered by the Committee on the Judiciary and also by the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SMOOT. The subject matter, however, is before the Committee on Public Lands. I think the communication and accom-

panying papers ought to be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, they will go to the Committee on Printing.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 65. An act to ratify, approve, and confirm an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii relating to certain gas, electric light and power, telephone, railroad, and street railway companies and franchises in the Territory of Hawaii, and amending the laws relating thereto;

H. R. 153. An act to create a Bureau of Labor Safety in the Department of Labor;

H. R. 407. An act to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3042. An act to ratify, approve, and confirm sections 1, 2, and 3 of an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii relating to the board of harbor commissioners of the Territory, as herein amended, and amending the laws relating thereto; and

H. R. 6241. An act to ratify, approve, and confirm an act amending the franchise granted to H. P. Baldwin, R. A. Wadsworth, J. N. S. Williams, D. C. Lindsay, C. D. Lufkin, James L. Coke, and W. T. Robinson, and now held under assignment to Island Electric Co. (Ltd.), by extending it to include the Makawao district on the island of Maui, Territory of Hawaii, and extending the control of the Public Utilities Commission of the Territory of Hawaii to said franchise and its holder.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. MYERS. I present a letter in the nature of a petition from Hon. A. M. Alderson, secretary of state of Montana, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD with his signature.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF MONTANA, SECRETARY OF STATE,
Helena, January 14, 1916.

To the PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: In 1907 reconnaissance and preliminary surveys were begun upon the Flathead irrigation project in northwestern Montana.

In 1908 a construction upon the project was authorized and the first appropriation made by act of Congress. In 1909 actual construction was begun.

In spite of the fact that since the beginning of actual work in 1909 more than six years have elapsed, the project is now only 22.2 per cent completed.

The Flathead project is the largest and most comprehensive Indian irrigation scheme ever undertaken in the United States. The area of the completed project is about 152,000 acres. There is not the slightest question but what all of these lands would easily pay the water-construction charge of \$45 an acre, or even more, if necessary.

There has been a large amount of settling upon these lands, but the people have found, to their sorrow, that they are unable to make a living without irrigation. They have been led to believe, and were entitled to believe, that the Government of the United States would complete this project.

It never can be completed within the lifetime of a settler now upon the project with such insignificant appropriations as have been made in recent years. A large amount of the work already accomplished will go to pieces and its value will be lost unless the work is pushed to final accomplishment.

The State of Montana is firmly of the opinion that an appropriation of \$1,000,000 should be made for the Flathead project this year of 1916, and we ardently hope that the Congress of the United States will recognize the necessity for such an appropriation.

I have the honor to remain,

Sincerely, yours,

A. M. ALDERSON,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MYERS. I present the petition of pupils of the Reservoir Valley School, in Montana, praying for an appropriation for the Flathead reclamation project in that State. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD with the name of the first signer and underneath the words "and many others" and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESERVOIR VALLEY SCHOOLHOUSE.

To the PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES:

The undersigned, pupils of the Reservoir Valley Schoolhouse, do most urgently and respectfully petition of Congress that an appropriation of not less than \$1,000,000 be passed by this session of Congress for work on the Flathead irrigation project for the ensuing year. This schoolhouse is located within the Flathead project and our education will depend to a large extent on the manner that this project is prosecuted.

Respectfully,

VENUS CAFFEY,
(And many others).

Mr. ASHURST. I present resolutions in the nature of a petition, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

There being no objection, the resolutions were read and referred to the Committee on Public Lands, as follows:

Whereas the Grand Canyon of the Colorado has been set aside by the President of the United States as a public monument; and
Whereas every part of this great region should be made accessible and usable in the largest degree to the public, as well as preserved for the good of generations to come; and
Whereas if this public monument were made a national park, the necessary care and attention could and would be given to it by the United States Government for the benefit of the present generation and posterity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Yavapai County Chamber of Commerce, through its board of directors, this 15th day of January, 1916. That they do hereby recommend and earnestly urge that the Grand Canyon of the Colorado be made a national park at the earliest date expedient; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Secretary of the Interior Franklin K. Lane, to Senators HENRY F. ASHURST and MARCUS A. SMITH, and to Representative CARL HAYDEN; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the various commercial organizations of Arizona, together with the request that they cooperate in every way to help secure the proper legislation.

Approved.

C. E. YOUNT, *President*.

Attest:

GRACE M. SPARKES, *Secretary*.

Mr. ASHURST. I present resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Yavapai County, Ariz. The resolutions relate to a delicate subject, and I ask that they be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WARREN. I have a telegram from the National Wool Growers' Association, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD without reading and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Telegram.]

SALT LAKE, UTAH, January 19, 1916.

Senator F. E. WARREN,
Washington, D. C.:

Probably Gov. Gooding, of Idaho, and myself will leave for Washington to-day. If we do not reach there in time, it is imperative that the stock trails provided for in the homestead bills should be at least 1 mile wide. You must remember that in order to reach forest reserves and shipping points sheep will have to be in these trails as long as 15 days, with no feed other than that furnished by the trails. Certainly no man should be allowed to make an additional entry unless it adjoins his original entry. We hope action on the bill can be delayed until we reach Washington, and we hope that the Senate will wait for the recommendations of the committee.

NATIONAL WOOL GROWERS' ASSOCIATION.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a petition of sundry citizens of Monroe, Mich., praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the University Club of Harbor Springs, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of S. A. Valentine Camp, No. 21, Department of Michigan, United Spanish War Veterans, of Escanaba, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to widows and orphans of veterans of the Spanish War, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GRONNA. I have here resolutions adopted by the Devils Lake District Medical Society, of North Dakota, calling attention to the lack of a sufficient number of medical officers in the Regular Army. I ask that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEVILS LAKE DISTRICT MEDICAL SOCIETY,
Devils Lake, North Dakota.

Hon. A. J. GRONNA, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the Devils Lake District Medical Society January 11, 1916, the following resolution was passed and a copy ordered sent to the Secretary of War and our Senators and Congressmen:

"Whereas the President and the honorable Secretary of War have announced in the public press that a scheme for the reorganization of the Army will be presented to Congress at its coming session which will materially increase the military establishment; and

"Whereas we recall the indignant protests and criticisms of the Nation at the failure to provide adequately for the sick and wounded at the beginning of the Civil War and the Spanish-American War; and

"Whereas it is known that this failure was due to the lack of a sufficient number of medical officers in the Regular Army and a means for increasing the medical establishment at the outbreak of war; and

"Whereas in spite of the lessons of the Spanish-American War, which were fresh in mind in the reorganization of the Army in 1901, the medical department was not properly increased, and no provision was made for its expansion in time of emergency; and

"Whereas to correct the defects in the 1901 legislation subsequent legislation was necessary, in which the medical profession of the United States was called on to assist: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Devils Lake Medical Society of North Dakota. That the Secretary of War be petitioned to make adequate provision in the reorganization of the Army about to be presented to Congress for a sufficient number of medical officers for the regular establishment, which provision should aggregate a proportion of medical officers of at least seventy-five hundredths of 1 per cent of the enlisted strength of the Army, or such number as the Surgeon General of the Army may deem necessary; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary be petitioned to make provision in this reorganization for the expansion of the medical department at the beginning of war by calling into service in the Medical Reserve Corps physicians from civil life who have been instructed in their special duties as medical officers in our summer camps and otherwise, as the War Department may see fit."

G. F. DREW,

Secretary Devils Lake Medical Society.

Mr. HARDING presented memorials of sundry citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, remonstrating against an additional tax on intoxicating liquors, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Mansfield, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to civil-service employees, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

He also presented petitions of the congregation of the Congregational Church of Norwalk, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Norwalk, and of sundry citizens of North Olmsted, all in the State of Ohio, praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented petitions of the congregation of the Congregational Church of Norwalk, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Norwalk, and of sundry citizens of North Olmsted, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the pure-food law to make misdemeanors false and fraudulent statements regarding curative qualities of medicines, which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented petitions of the congregation of the Congregational Church of Norwalk, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Norwalk, and of sundry citizens of North Olmsted, all in the State of Ohio, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Sandusky Council, Knights of Columbus, of Sandusky, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to set aside October 12 as Columbus Day, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry inmates of the Soldiers' Home of Sandusky, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide pensions for widows and orphans of veterans of the Spanish War, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented a petition of sundry citizens of New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide a fixed price for trade-marked and patented articles, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Memorial Baptist Church, of Albany, N. Y., praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of B. F. Gladding & Co., of South Otsele, N. Y., praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WEEKS presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 413, Loyal Order of Moose, of Quincy, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to civil-service employees, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Boston, Mass., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to grant the right of suffrage to women, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Methodist Preachers' Association, of Springfield, Mass., remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the American Writing Paper Co., of Holyoke, Mass., praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland presented a petition of the congregation of the Whitney Avenue Memorial Christian Church, of Washington, D. C., praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I ask to have printed in the RECORD a telegram which I have just received. It is short.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Telegram.]

DOUGLAS, WYO., January 20, 1916.

Senator CLARK, Washington, D. C.:

Please withhold action on homestead and leasing bill just passed by House until you can hear from a delegation appointed by the National Wool Growers and a delegation to be appointed by the American National Live Stock Association at El Paso 25th to 27th this month, if possible to do so. Please answer.

J. M. WILSON.

OIL LANDS IN CALIFORNIA.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a telegram bearing upon the proposed legislation affecting the oil industry in California. I ask to have it read.

There being no objection, the telegram was read and referred to the Committee on Public Lands, as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CAL., January 19, 1916.

Hon. JOHN D. WORKS,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Please have following petition read in Senate immediately:

"To the President and Congress of the United States:

"A multitude of citizens of the United States, some thousands in number, who are the threatened victims of legislation concerning oil lands now pending in the National Congress, hereby beg leave to enter protest against any precipitate and hurried legislation upon the subject referred to. The bills as now pending bear every evidence of superficiality in their sweeping emasculation of long-established statutory laws which have been the basis of a rational and uniform development of the national domain for over a half century. They absolutely wreck a most important division of the national land system and leave in confusion the legal status of vested rights acquired by a large element of worthy and industrious citizens who are seeking to acquire property under laws sanctified by long usage. The bills referred to bear strong evidence of having been inspired by those who have been the recipients of munificent donations from the General Government and whose holdings are now the subject of judicial inquiry. The proposed enactments are not only confiscatory but are punctuated with ambiguities which will require an untold amount of litigation to determine their legal significance. If such legislation is enacted it will paralyze every effort of the man of modest means who has withstood the privations and severities of a desert country in seeking mineral wealth, believing that the legislatures and courts of both State and Nation would insure to him the full protection of rights acquired by him under the established mineral laws of the United States, which have been in full force and operation for many decades. Any law which imperils or destroys property rights thus acquired can only result in intensifying and expanding the growing popular idea that it is the purpose of the Government to preserve the public domain for the exclusive benefit of the rich and powerful and add to the difficulties of the poor who are seeking to acquire property rights by a strict conformity to the laws of the land. The bills which are pending before the House and Senate should each be entitled 'A law for the establishment of a monopoly of all fuel and power for the benefit of those who have already been enriched by donations from the public domain.' No possible statute could more effectually create and perpetuate such a monopoly, as no private individual or association of persons outside of the great interests themselves could acquire any portion of the public domain by lease with any possible hope of producing an article of commerce therefrom with the handicap of Government supervision and taxation and market such article in competition with those who have already received vast donations of public mineral lands and are exempt forever from any burdens of public surveillance and onerous royalties. The vast majority of legislators have received no information emanating from the private operator in the field except that which has been manipulated and mutilated by influences in close touch with those who frame the laws and give them color and effect. The small operator and prospector have been totally ignored, and their plea for consideration has been smothered by the adroitness of preponderating wealth and sinister politics. Already the atmosphere is becoming malodorous with sensational charges of a political and financial nature which promise to culminate in scandals unequalled in national legislation. Your petitioners enter an earnest plea that all legislation of this character may be delayed until proper consideration can be given to same unmixed with and unsmothered by the tumultuous clamor over international affairs. It is no time for revolutionary legislation touching purely domestic questions, whose consideration is overshadowed by world affairs which now completely absorb the popular mind, and it is the almost universal opinion of those best advised that this particular hour and condition has been selected to perpetrate this ill-advised and outrageous legislative felony. The President and Congress will at an early date receive expression from the thousands whose little all is at stake through the medium of mass meetings held for this purpose for the reasons above stated. A rational delay on such drastic legislation is hereby implored."

JNO. J. MORRIS,
WM. T. FORSYTH,
D. F. WILSON,

Committee Representing over 300 Bona Fide Oil Land Locators.

FREIGHT CONGESTION AT OCEAN DOCKS.

Mr. WORKS. I also send up a letter from the Chamber of Commerce, of Santa Cruz, Cal., on the subject of the congestion of freight at ocean docks, and ask to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Chamber of Commerce of Santa Cruz urgently calls the attention of Congress to the congestion of freight at ocean docks which is seriously threatening the prosperity of the Nation in general and of the Northwest in particular.

Millions of tons of freight, the products of our farms and factories, are piling up in freight cars, in storage, and on the wharves at water terminals, unable to find bottoms for transportation to the markets of the world. Far from offering relief, the situation assumes a graver aspect every day and must inevitably cause reaction, which may cause a material depression in the price of farm products and stagnation in the work of our factories.

Our farmers and merchants are losing, perhaps forever, the new opportunities and the new markets now open before them, because of a state of paralysis in international means of transportation and the greed of foreign shipowners over which our Government has no jurisdiction: It is therefore

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be urged to speedily adopt emergency measures to adequately meet this situation and to place at the disposal of the President full power to employ all the executive agencies of the Government for the purpose of reopening the congested arteries of trade.

S. A. PALMER, President.

A. S. T. JOHNSON, Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. NORRIS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (S. 710) to authorize national banking associations to avail themselves of State laws providing for the guaranteeing of deposits, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 61) thereon.

Mr. STONE. By direction of the Committee on Foreign Relations I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 3264) to authorize the payment of an indemnity to the Norwegian Government for the detention of three subjects of Norway in Hudson County, N. J., and I submit a report (No. 60) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

PAYMENT OF CLAIMS.

Mr. CATRON. From the Committee on Claims, I report back favorably, with an amendment, the bill (S. 1878) making appropriation for payment of certain claims in accordance with findings of the Court of Claims, reported under the provisions of the acts approved March 3, 1883, and March 3, 1887, and commonly known as the Bowman and the Tucker Acts, and under the provisions of section No. 151 of the act approved March 3, 1911, commonly known as the Judicial Code, and I submit a report (No. 59) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the bill go to the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

BROWNS FERRY BRIDGE, MISSOURI.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce, I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 4716) to authorize Dunklin County, Mo., and Clay County, Ark., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River, and I submit a report (No. 58) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ST. FRANCIS RIVER BRIDGE, MISSOURI.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce, I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 6448) to authorize Butler and Dunklin Counties, Mo., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River, and I submit a report (No. 57) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. RANDELL:

A bill (S. 3721) for the relief of the estate of Thomas F. Swafford, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3722) to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Baton Rouge, La.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 3723) providing for the holding of terms of the district court for the southern division of the western district of the State of Washington at Aberdeen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 3724) authorizing the setting aside of certain lands for highway purposes through the public domain, forests, and other reserves of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3725) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Patterson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SIMMONS:

A bill (S. 3726) for the relief of J. A. Denny;

A bill (S. 3727) for the relief of William Lewis Bryan;

A bill (S. 3728) for the relief of the heirs of Elijah D. Guthrie;

A bill (S. 3729) for the relief of Ben Pigott;

A bill (S. 3730) for the relief of George Jenkins;

A bill (S. 3731) for the relief of John G. Young;

A bill (S. 3732) to refund the cotton tax to the States wherein collected;

A bill (S. 3733) for the relief of Sarah R. Hay;

A bill (S. 3734) for the relief of Martha A. Moffitt, widow of Eli A. Moffitt; and

A bill (S. 3735) for the relief of Cleveland L. Short; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 3737) providing for an investigation into the extent and conditions of the practice of experimentation on living animals; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 3738) granting an increase of pension to Julia C. Bradley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 3739) granting a pension to James Gallagher;

A bill (S. 3740) granting a pension to Anna C. Gregory;

A bill (S. 3741) granting a pension to Lucy S. Hamilton; and

A bill (S. 3742) granting a pension to Mary C. Christensen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BECKHAM:

A bill (S. 3743) to reimburse John Simpson; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3744) granting an increase of pension to Emma Luman (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3745) granting an increase of pension to Mary Eliza Swise (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3746) granting an increase of pension to Alice A. McDonald (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3747) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie Gray (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3748) granting an increase of pension to Caroline M. Colburn (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3749) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Fist (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3750) granting an increase of pension to John Clinger (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3751) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Hughes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 3752) granting an increase of pension to George H. Stillman;

A bill (S. 3753) granting an increase of pension to Herman F. W. Fisher;

A bill (S. 3754) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Sausaman;

A bill (S. 3755) granting an increase of pension to William A. Dodge;

A bill (S. 3756) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Riddle; and

A bill (S. 3757) granting an increase of pension to James S. Anderson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland:

A bill (S. 3758) for the relief of the heirs of William S. Shoemaker, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 3759) for the relief of Wellington F. Larabee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JAMES:

A bill (S. 3760) granting an increase of pension to Berry H. Smith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 84) authorizing the appointment of a board to ascertain and report to Congress the probable cost of acquiring lands on each side of Pennsylvania Avenue as sites for buildings necessary for the transaction of present and

prospective governmental business; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

PORTSMOUTH (N. H.) DRY DOCK.

Mr. GALLINGER. I introduce a bill which is a duplicate of one I introduced at the last session, and I ask that it be received and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The bill (S. 3736) making an appropriation toward the construction of a dry dock at the Portsmouth Navy Yard was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—JOHN G. YOUNG.

On motion of Mr. OVERMAN, it was

Ordered, That the papers in the case of John G. Young (S. 3237, 63d Cong.) be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, no adverse report having been made thereon.

PUGET SOUND CANAL, WASHINGTON.

Mr. JONES submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause preliminary examination and survey to be made and a report to be made thereon to Congress of the intervening territory between Puget Sound and the Columbia River, with a view to determining the advisability of constructing a canal connecting Puget Sound with Grays Harbor, Willapa Harbor, and the Columbia River.

STRATEGIC VALUE OF INLAND WATERWAYS (S. DOC. NO. 249).

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I have here an address delivered by the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] at the eighth annual convention of the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association, held at Savannah, Ga., the 9th of November last, on the subject of the strategic value of inland waterways. It is a most exhaustive and illuminating discussion of the necessity of the improvement and enlargement of our coastwise waterways. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a public document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXPORTATION OF LOGWOOD FROM JAMAICA.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have a letter from Hon. Robert Lansing, Secretary of State, in reference to the question of the embargo on the exportation of logwood from Jamaica. As this is a matter which concerns very deeply the textile industries of the country, as well as certain other industries, I ask that it be printed in the Record without reading.

Mr. STONE. The letter just presented by the Senator from New Hampshire concerns logwood imported from what country?

Mr. GALLINGER. It relates directly to the embargo on the exportation of logwood from Jamaica, but it touches other countries.

Mr. STONE. Would it not be well to have the letter, after it is printed, referred to the Committee on Finance?

Mr. GALLINGER. I think it ought to be done, and I ask that that course be taken.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 15, 1916.

The Hon. JACOB H. GALLINGER,
United States Senate.

SIR: With reference to previous correspondence with this department in regard to the British embargo on the exportation of logwood from Jamaica, I have the honor to inform you that the department is in receipt of the following cablegram from the American ambassador at London, dated January 13, 1916:

"Foreign office now informs me that as urgent requirements of Great Britain have been met, governor of Jamaica has issued general license permitting export of logwood chips and logwood extract to all British, United States, French, and Italian ports, and that instructions are being sent to governor of British Honduras to issue similar license. It is added that in informing me of measures taken by British Government to facilitate relaxation of embargo in favor of manufacturers in United States it is desired to explain that relaxation must necessarily be conditional on British Government being satisfied that supply of dyewood extract from United States to Canada will be resumed on reasonable scale, and states that they have no doubt but that I will be in a position to give this assurance in view of efforts which have been made by British authorities to meet convenience of American manufacturers."

"Please instruct me if I can give the assurance that dyewood extract is being sent from United States to Canada."

As the lifting of the embargo on logwood in favor of manufacturers in the United States is made conditional on the British Government being satisfied that the supply of dyewood extract from the United States to Canada will be resumed on a reasonable scale, the question of whether American firms are able to obtain logwood from Jamaica and British Honduras will depend on whether the manufacturers of logwood extract, of whom the department is informed there are only two or three, are willing to resume exportation to Canada on a reasonable scale. The department has as yet received no assurances from manufacturers of logwood extract that they will do this.

Information received from American consular officers stationed along the Caribbean coasts and in the West Indies, in response to instructions from the Department of State, directing them to ascertain what supplies of logwood were available for shipment to the United States, indicate that at the present time the only available supply of logwood outside of Jamaica and British Honduras is apparently in Haiti with the possibility of the development of a supply on a reasonable scale from the districts surrounding Barranquilla, Colombia.

I have the honor to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,

ROBERT LANSING.

SEIZURES OF COTTON AND FOODSTUFFS BY GREAT BRITAIN.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, at an earlier day during the session I had an opportunity to address the Senate with reference to the orders in council of March 1 and March 11, passed by Great Britain. I then called attention to the fact that the order of March 11 was, in effect, a declaration of blockade against all the ports of Germany; that it was a direction to enforce that blockade by seizing neutral vessels before they passed the straits which separated Denmark, Norway, and Sweden; that so far as Norway and Sweden and the Baltic coast were concerned it was ineffective and illegal, on account of the fact that Great Britain could not blockade the ports of Germany on the Baltic against the vessels of Norway and Sweden; and that no blockade can be enforced legally unless it is enforced against all neutrals alike.

I also called attention to the fact that this order directed the seizure of the commerce of neutrals going into and out of neutral ports without regard to the character of the goods, if those goods were of presumed German origin or destination.

The illegality of those orders, their disregard of recognized rules of international law, is so apparent that no real effort has been made in Great Britain to defend them. We now hear that Great Britain is about to recede from those two orders. I am not surprised at that. No British statesman of any prominence now a part of the British Government or who is in Parliament has failed within the past 12 years upon the floor of Parliament to denounce as illegal the very procedure of Great Britain which is being conducted at the present time under the order of council of March 11.

We are told that with the repeal of the orders of March 1 and March 11 by the privy council we are to have a direction for a real, genuine blockade of German ports, and that the effect of that action will be to tighten the blockade, and to still further restrict the trade of neutrals with Germany. Some of our newspaper correspondents are, thoughtlessly I hope, scattering the idea that, with a complete declaration of blockade, some increased right of interference will be given to the British Government.

Mr. President, if a declaration of absolute blockade were made, it would change the present status only to this extent: The present order in council leaves it to the discretion of the prize courts as to how they shall handle goods of neutrals seized when seeking to reach blockaded ports. The complete order of blockade would simply subject the vessels and their cargoes seeking to reach blockaded ports to confiscation. But, Mr. President, no neutral vessels are seeking to enter German ports that are now blockaded. Our real contest with Great Britain is the interference with our trade through neutral ports, and no blockade can extend to neutral ports. Blockade is an act of war; it is a part of the process of war directed toward an enemy's soil. It can not be directed toward the soil of a neutral.

On a former occasion I presented to the Senate decision after decision by the courts of Great Britain sustaining the proposition that I have just laid down. I cited text-writer after text-writer, and English judicial decisions from distinguished English authors and jurists, in support of the proposition that a blockade can not reach a neutral port; that the right of interference at neutral ports is limited to the character of the goods. It can only be based on the contraband character of the goods, which means that their character is such that they will be used in war by the military or naval forces of the enemy of Great Britain.

Goods have been classified as "absolute" and "conditional contraband" to assist in deciding the question of evidence required to justify the seizure; "absolute," of such a warlike nature that, going to a belligerent country, they are presumed to be intended for the army, and therefore can be seized on account of their character; "conditional contraband," goods which might be so used, and which might also equally be used by noncombatants; and in this case no seizure can be made unless the belligerent seizing them establishes the fact that they are really to be used by the military and naval forces of the opposing belligerent, the burden being upon the belligerent seizing the goods to make the proof.

Mr. President, the English rule has been that conditional contraband going to a neutral port could not be seized at all. Let me illustrate by foodstuffs. Ten per cent of the people are probably in arms and 90 per cent noncombatants. There are, there-

fore, nine chances out of ten that the food might be used by the noncombatants. If it is to be so used, it has the right to go to an opposing belligerent through a neutral port untouched.

Mr. President, I desire to call attention to the fact that, even though an absolute blockade is directed in the broadest sense, our State Department has already committed us, and correctly committed us, squarely to the proposition that such a blockade would give no right to seize innocent goods owned, by neutral citizens, sailing from neutral ports to neutral ports, even though those goods are to be sent to an opposing belligerent—to Germany or to Austria. I will read just a line from the letter of March 30 from our State Department sent to Great Britain:

It is confidently assumed that His Majesty's Government will not deny that it is a rule sanctioned by general practice that, even though a blockade should exist and the doctrine of contraband as to unblockaded territory be rigidly enforced, innocent shipments may be freely transported to and from the United States through neutral countries to belligerent territory without being subject to the penalties of contraband traffic or breach of blockade, much less to detention, requisition, or confiscation.

I quote, Mr. President, three other extracts from this letter, and I shall quote during my remarks a number of extracts from various papers. I will call attention to their substance, and ask leave now from the Senate to embody in the Record the exact language.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The quotation I have just read is an assertion of the right of citizens of neutral countries to trade with the enemies of Great Britain through neutral ports in noncontraband goods. This is an assertion of the right without regard to the orders of March 1 and March 11 last, and even though a formal blockade were declared.

Again, the letter states:

And no claim on the part of Great Britain of any justification for interfering with these clear rights of the United States and its citizens as neutrals could be admitted. To admit it would be to assume an attitude of unneutrality toward the present enemies of Great Britain which would be obviously inconsistent with the solemn obligations of this Government in the present circumstances.

Again, the letter states:

But the novel and quite unprecedented feature of that blockade, if we are to assume it to be properly so defined, is that it embraces many neutral ports and coasts—bars access to them.

Again, it states:

It is manifest that such limitations, risks, and liabilities placed upon the ships of a neutral power on the high seas * * * are a distinct invasion of the sovereign rights of the nation whose ships, trade, or commerce is interfered with.

These and other strong expressions are found in this letter protesting as illegal any effort by Great Britain to blockade the neutral ports of northern Europe against the trade of neutral nations in neutral goods.

The course of Great Britain and the threatened course are well understood by British statesmen to be illegal.

Its continuance is so palpable a violation of the rights of neutrals that no self-respecting nation should submit to it.

Some, even in the United States, have replied that the exigencies of war excuse the British Government for disregarding the rights of American citizens.

I wish to submit a few authorities to show that no nation has a right by municipal regulation to set aside rules or international law and thereby interfere with the rights of trade of a neutral nation.

In second Dallas, the Supreme Court of the United States held "the municipal law of a country can not change the law of nations so as to bind the subjects of another nation."

Time and again the Department of State of the United States has declared a municipal decree "whether executive, legislative, or judicial, contravening the law of nations has no extra-territorial force."

Mr. Evarts, when Secretary of State, announced—

If a Government confesses itself unable or unwilling to conform to those international obligations which must exist between established Governments of friendly States, it would thereby confess that it is not entitled to be regarded or recognized as a sovereign or independent power.

When Ecuador undertook to set up by statute rules subversive of the principles of international law, our State Department declared that "Ecuador placed herself outside of the pale of international intercourse."

Sir Henry Maine, in his work upon international law, declares that—

the State which disclaims the authority of international law places herself outside the circle of civilized nations.

In the first chapter of Moore's Digest of International Law many authorities upon this subject will be found.

The rules of international law come to us from the established customs of nations. The sovereignty of a nation extends to the

commerce of her people upon the ocean; and no opposing nation can interfere with the merchandise of a citizen of another nation not at war, except where the customs of nations have conceded the right of seizure. No nation, by a municipal regulation, can set up a rule of its own in defiance of the customs of nations, and seize the goods of a neutral without being guilty of a lawless act.

But let us see for a moment why the regulation of the privy council is passed. Why are not simply orders issued to the naval forces to seize these vessels and stop this commerce? The reason is obvious. If the cases were permitted to go to the British prize courts with only the direction by the Government of Great Britain to its navy, the prize courts would decide the cases under the rules of international law, and the conduct of Great Britain would at once be stopped by releases in her prize courts of all these illegal seizures. But Great Britain, through her privy council, which is a legislative body, sets aside rules of international law and prescribes a new rule for the seizure of goods of neutrals. Her prize courts are bound by their order, and are prevented from following rules of international law.

There is but one remedy for a neutral nation. It is to contest the orders of the British Privy Council, to assert our rights as a nation. Our citizens can have no redress under these orders in British prize courts.

Treating as established the rules of international law sustained by authority and brought to the attention of the Senate on a previous occasion, I wish to ask consideration of the order of August 21 by the British Privy Council declaring cotton absolute contraband and then to point out the violation by Great Britain of the rights of citizens of the United States, both in its treatment of foodstuffs and of cotton.

COTTON CONTRABAND ORDER.

Never but once before has any country sought to interfere with the free shipment of cotton. It has been recognized as a commodity largely entering into the peaceful uses of the people of the world, and therefore has never been classified as contraband but once before.

This was in the case of Russia, during the Japanese war.

The pretext for the declaration was the use of cotton for the manufacture of powder and explosives. Great Britain promptly protested the action of Russia.

Russia yielded, and cotton continued to be shipped by subjects of Great Britain from India and Egypt to Japan.

I wish, first, to answer the defense of this action which has been widely circulated by English agents and pro-English newspapers.

It has been upon two lines:

First. That the United States made cotton contraband during the Civil War.

Second. That cotton is essential to the manufacture of powder and explosives in Germany, and by the suppression of cotton shipments into Germany the war power of Germany and her allies may be destroyed.

UNITED STATES NEVER DECLARED COTTON CONTRABAND.

As to the first of these claims, it is sillily false. The United States never made cotton contraband during the Civil War. This old story is fully exposed by Moore, in his *Digest of International Law*. A classification of contraband is based upon the unneutral nature of the goods, and authorizes one belligerent to prevent those goods from entering the country of an enemy nation. It is to keep the enemy from obtaining possession of goods which would be used for military purposes.

What would have been the sense of an order classifying cotton as contraband to prevent it from being shipped into the Southern States? Nobody wanted to ship it into the Southern States. It was already there. They had almost a monopoly of its production. The claim was false and stupid.

Yet, Sir Gilbert Parker, the publicity agent for Great Britain, distributed an article defending the order making cotton absolute contraband, written by Hon. Bernard R. Wise, and justifying the order upon the ground that the United States made cotton contraband during the Civil War.

Now let me deal with the second British excuse.

CONSPIRACY TO INJURE COTTON.

After depressing the price of cotton in the fall of 1914, the British spinners organized to depress the price again in 1915. One-third of the exports of American cotton normally go to Germany and Austria and the neutral ports of northern Europe. Germany and Austria alone consume nearly 3,000,000 of bales annually.

If the British spinners and cotton manufacturers could cut off this market for cotton raised in the United States, it would naturally depress the price. If they could cut it off, they would

exclude the products of German mills from competing with the products of English mills throughout the world.

When the great patriotic gathering was held early in the summer of 1915 in London to demand that cotton should be made absolute contraband, that great soldier, Sir Charles McKara, presided at the meeting. His military record, so far as it is known, is limited to the office which he fills. He is president of the English Cotton Spinners' Association.

I can not believe that English statesmen were so poorly informed, or so lacked capacity for observation, that they did not understand the real purpose of the movement.

When Sir William Ramsey advocated in the *London Times* placing cotton on the absolute contraband list, he asserted that it was essential to the manufacture of explosives and most of the powder used by Germany. A far more distinguished British scientist flatly contradicted him. Mr. W. F. Reid, former president of the Society of Chemical Industry of Great Britain, spoke as follows before that society in London:

The whole thing is a great fraud. Eminent scientists have made erroneous statements on this subject. If people associated with science would speak only on the branches with which they are connected, the advantages would be very great.

COTTON NOT USED TO MAKE POWDER IN GERMANY.

I shall show by abundant evidence that for months before the order making cotton absolute contraband Germany had substituted wood cellulose for lint cotton in the production of powders. The use of cotton for the manufacture of powder has always been confined principally to what is called linters. Linters are the short waste scraped from cotton seed at the oil mill when the seed are being ground. Manufacturers' waste consists of the very short particles of cotton that fly off as the cotton is spun. Linters and manufacturers' waste, when used as a base for powder, are ground to pulp. They then become the base or filler which is treated with explosive acids to make powder.

Linters and manufacturers' waste are of but little ordinary value, and have usually sold at very low prices. They form a cheap and useful base for nitrocellulose powders. The manufacture of powders of this character by the use of cotton linters or waste began in 1854. Long before the war in Germany cellulose had been made from wood pulp, and this wood-pulp cellulose had occasionally been used as a substitute for cotton linters and manufacturers' waste in the manufacture of nitrocellulose powders.

Shortly after the war began it was published that Germany was abandoning the use of cotton linters and waste and building numerous plants for the manufacture of wood cellulose as a base or filler for nitrocellulose powders.

I am now prepared to show that for months past Germany has abandoned the use of cotton in the manufacture of powders and is using wood cellulose as the filler for its nitrocellulose powders.

President Lohman, of the Bremen Chamber of Commerce, is one of the foremost business men of Germany. In a speech delivered last month before the Bremen Chamber of Commerce he declared that for more than eight months Germany had used wood pulp as a substitute for cotton in the manufacture of nitrocellulose powders.

I have in my hand a letter from Dr. W. Will, director of the Central Bureau of Technico-Scientific Research of the University of Bremen. He declares that the chemists of Germany long before the war began understood the use of wood pulp as a substitute for cotton in the manufacture of nitrocellulose powders, and that for months past the substitute had been used in the German powder mills, and used with perfect success.

I ask that his letter be printed in the *Record* as an exhibit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. (The letter referred to is printed in the appendix at the end of Mr. SMITH's remarks.)

REPORT OF MR. BIBLE.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. In the early fall Mr. Howard W. Bible, of North Carolina, whom I have known for a number of years, a most reputable citizen of the United States, returning from Germany, assured me that the lack of linters or cotton was in no way affecting the manufacture of powders in Germany; that wood pulp was used as a substitute. He intended returning to Germany in a few weeks, and, at my request, he agreed to personally investigate the subject while in Germany and to give me his testimony on the result of his investigation.

Mr. Bible is now in Washington. I have in my hand a letter from him, prepared last week. He is ready to testify before any committee of Congress upon this subject. He points out in this letter that, on returning to Germany, in Bremen he presented letters from me to President Lohman and explained my desire, if cotton had ceased to be used in Germany for the manufacture of powder and explosives, to furnish proof of that fact

for a protest I wished to make against the British order declaring cotton contraband.

President Lohman gave him his cordial support and arranged for a conference in Berlin between Mr. Bible and representatives of the various departments, that he might make his formal application to them for definite information and personal knowledge with reference to the use of cotton in the manufacture of gunpowder and explosives.

His letter states that, with President Lohman, he met representatives of the various departments by appointment in Berlin, and after presenting the objects of his investigation, he was assured by them that for months past the German Government had ceased to use cotton, and had with entire success substituted wood pulp in the manufacture of powder and explosives.

He was furnished a list of 60 mills in Germany engaged in the manufacture of wood cellulose, and also a list of munition plants, and authorized to visit such number as he saw fit, that he might have personal knowledge as to the materials therein used for the manufacture of powder.

He selected one plant, and, with Prof. Lohman and an officer of the German Government, he visited the plant; was permitted to go entirely through it, and found that all the raw material being brought in for manufacture into powder was wood cellulose, and that in some portions of the mill there were still rags used. He states that he found some cotton linters in the mill, but they had been laid aside, and were no longer used in the manufacture of powder.

He further states that he saw 3,000 bales of linters at one place which had been released by the munition department of the Government and disposed of to cotton factories.

I ask that Mr. Bible's letter be printed in full as an exhibit. The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have upon my desk packages of wood cellulose sent from Germany to me by Mr. Bible.

I defy anyone to produce proof to sustain the British claim. I was also advised by Mr. Bible that Col. Kuhn, our military attaché at Berlin, had been given the same opportunity to visit munition plants and to acquire the information that he, Mr. Bible, had acquired, and that Col. Kuhn was furnished the opportunity to know that Germany used no cotton in the manufacture of nitrocellulose powder.

I applied to the Secretary of War for Col. Kuhn's report. He could not give it to me. I have his letter here. First I applied orally. He explained to me the difficulty; that it was agreed between all countries that military attachés during a war were only permitted to remain in countries and make reports with the understanding that the neutral receiving them would regard them as absolutely confidential until the war was over, and for that reason he could not give me Col. Kuhn's report.

But the British embassy has admitted it. They did not intend to admit it, but they have admitted it. Yesterday, realizing that the false pretext upon which they justified their order making cotton absolute contraband had been and would be exploded, they issued a statement on the subject. I hold it in my hand. It begins:

The British military authorities have issued the following information with regard to the use of cotton for military purposes.

It goes on then to show how cotton can be used as a base for ballistite, cordite, and nitrocellulose powder. It shows how much is used of each when cotton is used as the base. It then says:

Apart from explosives, cotton forms the base of many fabrics and materials employed for military purposes, such as clothing, sheets—

And so forth.

I think we knew that before. I do not think it was a novel statement that sheets could be made out of cotton or that clothing could be made out of cotton. Then it closes:

The alleged use of substitutes for cotton in the manufacture of explosives does not affect the fact that cotton is a war material in general use.

What does that mean? About this: "We told you last summer that we made your cotton contraband, and we justified the order of March 1 and March 11, because by keeping cotton out of Germany we would end the war. We would put an end to Germany's munition-plant service; we would suppress their powder magazines, and leave her without anything in the shape of explosives to conduct the war. But now you know it is not so, and we say that even if it is not used for explosives, even though substitutes are used instead of cotton in Germany, still it is a war material in general use."

If anywhere among English writers or English statesmen before can be found such a statement, I invite its production. Nearly anything can be used in some way in connection with

war. That does not make it contraband as war material. Cotton can be used to make sheets. But sheets are not limited to soldiers. Cotton can be used to make clothes, and clothes are not limited to soldiers.

The very distinction that is drawn in treating the merchandise of neutrals is that a belligerent can not strike down the trade of a neutral simply because it might be used for military purposes. Every decision of Great Britain, every text writer of Great Britain, and every statesman of Great Britain for the last hundred years dealing with the subject has denounced any claim of right to interfere with neutral trade simply because it might in some way be used by an enemy army or navy. The rule has been laid down without interruption that the belligerent seizing goods must prove that they were intended for the army and navy, and that they were not for the use of noncombatants.

COTTON ALWAYS FREE FROM SEIZURE BY A BELLIGERENT.

Having disposed of the two excuses given by Great Britain for making cotton absolute contraband, let us consider the status which this commodity occupied under the customs of nations with reference to naval warfare.

The great majority of the people of the world are clothed with goods manufactured from cotton. In times of war not over 10 per cent of the population would be engaged in active service. Therefore, 90 per cent of the population of any country engaged in war would require in their peaceful pursuits the use of goods manufactured from cotton.

Recognizing this fact, cotton has uniformly been classed as an article which no nation could make contraband, but which all neutrals could ship freely to belligerent countries.

RUSSIA YIELDS TO BRITISH VIEW.

As before stated, the one exception was in the case of Russia, which, in 1904, during the war with Japan, declared cotton absolute contraband. England protested this action by Russia in the following language:

The quantity of raw cotton that might be used for explosives would be infinitesimal in comparison with the bulk of the cotton exported from India to Japan for peaceful purposes, and to treat harmless cargoes of this latter description as unconditionally contraband would be to subject a branch of innocent commerce to a most unwarrantable interference.

This was Great Britain's view even before wood cellulose had been developed as a substitute for cotton.

Oh, what does this letter from the British embassy look like when we consider this action of Great Britain toward Russia? But not only Great Britain, the United States protested. Mr. Hay, Secretary of State, sent a splendid letter to Russia on this subject. Among other things he said:

PROTEST BY MR. HAY.

Nor could the United States Government acquiesce in the treatment of raw cotton as absolutely contraband of war. While that product may enter to some extent into the manufacture of explosives and military clothing, the quantity of it used for such purposes is so far out of proportion to its uses in the arts of peace that the recognition of its treatment as absolutely contraband would, in principle, justify the same treatment of all forms of iron and steel, as well as wood, wool, all kinds of fuel, and all other materials which would be used in the manufacture of guns, carriages, or any other article of potentially military use, and would therefore be destructive of virtually all commerce of neutral States with the noncombatant population of belligerents. Cotton is one of the principal products of the United States. The crop for the year 1904 exceeds 12,000,000 bales. Its exportation from the United States is one of the principal items of its foreign commerce. To Japan alone the exportations of raw cotton during the periods specified were as follows:

	Raw cotton.		
	Bales.	Pounds.	Value.
Year ending Dec. 31, 1903.....	83,434	44,651,240	\$4,510,589
Eleven months ending Nov. 30, 1904.....	63,338	33,461,739	3,753,361

In view of the foregoing His Imperial Majesty's Government can not fail to perceive the deep concern with which the United States would view the establishment of precedents and the recognition of a principle which would work such disastrous consequences to its legitimate commerce with neutral States. According to the view of the United States Government expressed herein and in its circular of June 10 and its instructions of August 30 and September 1 last, the seizure and condemnation of neutral ships and goods on the broad grounds enunciated by Count Lamsdorff, would necessitate a radical change in the law of nations and in the procedure of prize tribunals, and would, if generally adopted, inflict incalculable injury upon great producing and exporting countries, like Russia and the United States, who are vitally concerned in the maintenance of the rights of legitimate commerce with the peoples of belligerent States.

Russia yielded, and the one exception of an effort by a nation to make cotton contraband having been abandoned by that nation on the protests of neutrals, emphasizes the rule that the customs of nations has fixed cotton as a commodity which can not be made contraband.

The story has been heralded by the press that Germany has declared cotton absolute contraband. I called on the State Department to verify it. They could not do it. They had no such notice, and they cabled Berlin for information, and the reply was that the statement was false. Yet there is a class of newspaper men who pick up anything they can to start and circulate it in the effort to justify the illegal conduct of Great Britain. It is not patriotic to be hunting for an opportunity to strike the commerce of your own country, and I am not proud of the men who do it.

DECLARATION OF LONDON.

The declaration of London covering the rules of international law applicable to naval warfare was signed February 26, 1909. It is gratifying to see that the press of the country is beginning to recognize the great value of the declaration of London as an authority upon the rules of naval warfare.

Still it is worth repeating that this declaration was prepared by the representatives of the 10 great naval powers of the world. They were called together at the instance of Great Britain to consider and, if possible, agree as to what were the correct rules of international law applicable to those branches of naval warfare submitted to them.

There were 40 delegates present chosen from England, France, Germany, Austria, Russia, Japan, Italy, Spain, the Netherlands, and the United States. Among their number were authors of distinction, naval officers who had made a specialty of the rules of international law applicable to naval warfare, professors of international law from great universities, and the counsellors of the state department of Great Britain.

The rules of international law which they announced were unanimously agreed to by them.

These rules classified contraband as "absolute" and "conditional" contraband.

They make a list of those commodities which by the customs of nations, on account of their general use for peaceful purposes, no nation is authorized to make contraband. They declare that the "free list" which they present can not be made contraband by any belligerent, and this free list is headed with "raw cotton."

BRITISH SUPPORTED CLASSIFICATION OF COTTON ON FREE LIST.

The British representatives to this conference, in a letter to their Government with reference to contraband, reported on March 30, 1909:

We . . . have secured the addition of a free list which will place it beyond the power of belligerents in the future to treat as contraband the raw material of some of the most important of our national industries.

When the declaration of London was considered by the House of Commons during the year 1911, the representatives of the Government prided themselves upon the fact that the London conference had placed cotton upon the free list, thereby preventing any belligerent in the future from ever treating cotton in any way as contraband. The opposition to the Government ridiculed the claim that this was valuable, because they insisted cotton was already established upon the free list by the recognized customs of nations.

Upon this subject Mr. Balfour said:

They pride themselves on having prevented cotton and wool and other things from being made contraband of war, and so far as I can make out only because one nation, again ineffectively and for a very brief time, said that cotton might be regarded as conditional contraband.

And Mr. Cave, one of the able lawyers of the House of Commons, in support of his contention that no nation could make cotton contraband, said:

A thing can not be made contraband unless it is declared contraband by the belligerent power and the claim is accepted by the neutral power. After all, treating a thing as contraband is taking away property—goods and possibly the ship—of other nations with which you have no quarrel at all, and in order to establish that you must have the assent of that nation to the transaction as a whole. Neutral nations agree to form a kind of ring around the two parties who are at war and not to assist either by sending goods which will help them in their warlike operations. The mere fact that one of the two nations says, "These goods assist my enemy in his operations," does not make those goods contraband. It is always a subject of controversy between neutrals and belligerent nations as to whether the neutrals will accept a declaration of contraband.

Great Britain has by a municipal regulation sought to make cotton absolute contraband.

The order making cotton absolute contraband was not only in violation of the customs of nations but in violation of the protest of Great Britain to Russia when Russia made cotton contraband in 1904.

It disregarded the provision of the declaration of London, which only permitted a belligerent to make absolute contraband goods which could be used alone for military purposes.

This provision of the declaration of London followed the instructions from the British Government to her delegates to this

conference, which advised them that it must be conceded under rules of international law that no belligerent could make anything absolute contraband which could be used for other than military purposes.

We may well protest the legality of the order of August 21, 1915, by the privy council of Great Britain making cotton absolute contraband.

It is the greatest export commodity produced in the United States. In the past century we have sold the export of cotton for \$16,750,000,000. It is now, with its legitimate markets open and including cotton seed, a crop worth \$1,000,000,000 a year. It furnishes employment in its culture and its manufacture to more people in the United States than any other commodity. We have no national asset of greater value.

ORDER HAS NOT SO FAR HURT COTTON.

It is true that the passage of the order making cotton absolute contraband last August did not of itself interfere with cotton shipments, but this was only because already, by the illegal orders of the privy council of Great Britain of March 1 and 11, 1915, the neutral ports of northern Europe had been blockaded.

All the commerce of citizens of the United States was, by these blockade orders of March 1 and 11, shut out from Germany and Austria, so that an order in August making cotton absolute contraband did not itself shut cotton out of Germany and Austria. It had already been shut out months before by the illegal blockade orders.

ANIMUS OF GREAT BRITAIN.

In this connection I call attention to the report of Consul General Robert P. Skinner, of London, which, on page 1055, reads as follows:

It continues to be the case that many classes of goods, the exportation of which from the United States to neutral countries is attended with great difficulty and hazard, are going forward freely from Great Britain to the same countries, and in some cases in largely increased quantities. * * * Exports of cotton, as reported under the cotton statistics act of 1868, were as follows up to August 5, 1915:

To August 5, 1915.....	American bales.	220, 847
To July 30, 1914.....		106, 382

During the months of March and August, 1915, inclusive, Great Britain, while seizing cargoes of cotton belonging to citizens of the United States and taking them into British ports, there to be sold, permitted her own citizens to ship 95,000 bales of cotton to Holland and Sweden alone, although the year previous they shipped only 6,200 bales during the same period.

Interference with shipments by citizens of the United States was lawless. The purpose of the interference is shown when citizens of Great Britain are permitted to ship American cotton to these points from which American citizens were excluded.

Sir Edward Grey and the British ambassador have sought to excuse this misconduct by pointing to increased shipments by American citizens to neutral countries of northern Europe during the year 1915. These shipments were made principally in January and February. They were not made after the British blockade was put into effect.

During the month of February, 1915, citizens of the United States shipped cotton to Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Germany to the amount of 450,000 bales.

The shipments in March, 1915, were seized and carried into British ports.

Shipments for April last dropped to 45,000 bales. Few of these reached their destination.

Shipments for May and June dropped to 25,000 bales, and finally efforts to ship cotton were practically abandoned.

There was a demand for a million bales of cotton owned by citizens of the United States in these countries from March to July. The illegal conduct of Great Britain cut off this market for the 1914 crop and cut off a market for 3,000,000 bales of the 1915 crop.

HISTORY OF COTTON SHIPMENTS SINCE WAR BEGAN.

There has been a continuous assault made upon the American cotton product in Great Britain since the war began.

During the fall of 1914 constant reports were circulated, apparently by authority in London, that cotton was about to be made contraband.

British marine insurance companies declined to insure cotton sailing to the ports of northern Europe.

The ports of Germany were not blockaded, and yet no cotton sailed to them. Practically no cotton sailed to Norway, Sweden, Denmark, or Holland.

The price of cotton in the United States fell to 6 cents a pound and less, while cotton in Germany was reported to be selling at over 20 cents a pound.

Finally, a resolution was introduced in the Senate on October 22, 1914, providing for the appointment of a committee which should seek through the State Department a formal declaration

from the British Government avowing its purposes with reference to cotton.

On the 26th of October, 1914, Sir Cecil Spring-Rice wrote Mr. Lansing, then Acting Secretary of State, as follows:

Last night I received a reply from Sir Edward Grey, in which he authorizes me to give the assurance that cotton will not be seized. He points out that cotton has not been put in any of our lists of contraband, and, as your department must be aware from the draft proclamation now in your possession, it is not proposed to include it in our new list of contraband. It is, therefore, as far as Great Britain is concerned, in the free list, and will remain there.

Mr. GALLINGER. What was the date of that answer, I will ask the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It was October 26, 1914. The absolute promise from the British Government less than two years ago in connection with this war, when possibly they did not know that Germany no longer needed cotton to make powder, was "cotton is on the free list, and will remain there."

Ah, the blush of shame must come to the cheeks of great Englishmen who for the past 20 years have been the exponents of international law, who have been the great leaders in defense of the rights of neutrals. They laid down the rules so clearly that the violation by Great Britain now is apparent. Surely Great Britain, on second thought, will rejoice once more to lead as the nation devoted to law.

This statement, furnished by Great Britain October 26, 1914, was freely circulated among cotton merchants, shipowners, and institutions in a position to finance cotton shipments.

By December cotton began to sail, with a German and Austrian destination. During the months of December, January, and February those two countries absorbed two and a quarter million bales of cotton raised in the United States.

The price of cotton began to rise, and by the early spring it had reached 10 cents a pound.

Then came the seizure of cotton under the illegal orders of Great Britain, passed March 1 and 11; cotton went down 2 cents a pound.

Later on it was discovered that the crop of 1915 was nearly 6,000,000 bales less than the crop of 1914. Besides this, the farmers had raised ample foodstuffs and were prepared to hold their cotton.

The facilities for financing loans afforded by the Federal Reserve System was another valuable aid in protecting the crop from sacrifice, and in spite of the lawless conduct of Great Britain, a fair price per pound for an ordinary-sized crop was obtained by the cotton farmers.

With their markets open, in view of the very short crop, the price would have been sufficient to have enabled them to recover some of their serious losses of the previous year.

Then, another thing is affecting the production of cotton, and that is that no potash now comes in from Germany. Nearly one-half the cotton land will practically yield little or no cotton without such an application. You can not grow cotton on some land without potash.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator means that cotton can not be grown on sandy soil without potash.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes. I was just going on to say that the land without potash is a sandy loam. In certain sections of our States where clay is found potash also is found, but in our sandy-loam lands the application of some potash by artificial addition is necessary. That is certainly the case in my own State, and I suppose it is so everywhere.

Mr. TILLMAN. That is true everywhere.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; and the inability to obtain potash, with the consequent reduction in the size of the crop, has helped to keep up the price of cotton. The customs of nations had freed cotton shipped by neutrals to belligerents from seizure. It had placed it upon a free list, which could not be made contraband and could not be subject to seizure.

Great Britain led in the protest when Russia undertook to make cotton contraband, and forced Russia to permit cotton to pass free.

Forty distinguished students of international law, meeting at the instance of Great Britain to codify the rules of international law applicable to naval warfare, unanimously agreed that cotton should head the list of items free from seizure by belligerents and which no belligerent could make contraband.

When the declaration of London was before the House of Commons in 1911 all members of the House of Commons who spoke upon the subject took the position that cotton could not be made contraband by a belligerent and must be permitted to pass free.

As late as October 26, 1914, the British Government assured our Government that cotton is, "as far as Great Britain is concerned, in the free list and will remain there."

Are we quietly to submit? Are we to permit the rights of the people of this country in commerce to be ruthlessly and knowingly disregarded? I come now to foodstuffs.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, would it interrupt the Senator from Georgia if I should ask him a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am intensely interested in this discussion, because I believe that Great Britain has gone very far beyond her rights in one direction during the progress of this European war. I will therefore ask the Senator if the State Department of this administration holds a different view from what the Senator himself does on this subject; and, if it does not, has any earnest effort been made to correct the existing condition of things?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will answer the Senator from New Hampshire. I introduced my remarks by a clear, clean, intense protest against the legality of the course of Great Britain made by the administration. The letter of March 30 is strong and emphatic. Again, the letter of October asserts our rights in the plainest and most forcible way. The position already taken by the State Department is in entire accord with every view of the law which I have presented. I am simply seeking before the Senate and the country to support those declarations of our legal right in a more elaborate way than a state paper could properly do.

FOODSTUFFS.

I wish now to bring to the attention of the Senate the illegal manner in which Great Britain has treated the commerce of neutrals in foodstuffs during the present war.

Foodstuffs have been classified uniformly as conditional contraband. Under this classification they could only be seized by a belligerent, according to the view of most nations, when they were sailing to a port of an enemy, and when the proof showed that they were there to be used by the armed forces of the enemy. If the proof failed to show that the foodstuffs were not to be used by noncombatants, then the foodstuffs had the right, shipped by neutrals, to enter a belligerent country, and no opposing belligerent had the right to seize them.

Great Britain has been seizing foodstuffs since the winter of 1914, even if they were sailing to neutral ports and without any proof that they were going to a belligerent country for the use of the military or naval forces of the opposing belligerent.

Millions of dollars of goods belonging to citizens of the United States have been ordered confiscated by the prize courts of Great Britain, when the goods were shipped to Sweden and to other neutral countries, with no proof presented that they were going to the military or naval forces of Germany or Austria or of any belligerent opposing Great Britain.

This conduct of Great Britain was used by Germany as a pretext for the submarine warfare, which was declared to be a retaliatory measure.

In February the United States addressed letters to each of the Governments urging that each withdraw from the respective lines of conduct just mentioned. Germany practically agreed to accept the proposition and Great Britain refused.

ILLEGAL ORDER OF PRIVY COUNCIL.

I have no doubt that the basis for the decision of the English prize courts is found in the order of the British privy council of October 29, 1914, which directs the following modification of the declaration of London:

PAR. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of article 35 of the declaration of London, conditional contraband shall be liable to capture on board a vessel bound for a neutral port if the goods are consigned to order, or if the ship's papers do not show who is the consignee of the goods, or if they show a consignee of the goods in territory belonging to or occupied by the enemy.

PAR. 4. In cases covered by the preceding paragraph it shall lie upon the owners of the goods to prove that their destination was innocent.

Paragraph 35 of the declaration of London provides:

Conditional contraband is not liable to capture except when found on board a vessel bound for territory belonging to or occupied by the enemy, or for the armed forces of the enemy, when it is not to be discharged in an intervening neutral port.

This provision in the declaration of London was unquestionably a correct statement of the recognized rule of international law.

The British orders just quoted directed the naval forces of that country and the prize courts of that country to abandon the rules of international law which distinguished absolute from conditional contraband.

Under the rules of international law foodstuffs could not be seized when sailing upon a vessel bound to a neutral port. By this order England determined to seize them, though sailing to a neutral port.

According to the rules of international law, a neutral could ship foodstuffs to Germany or Austria, unless it was proven to be going for the use of the military or naval forces of Germany or Austria. By this order Great Britain directed that foodstuffs should be seized if going through a neutral port consigned to private citizens in Germany or Austria. If the foodstuffs were going at all into Germany or Austria, Great Britain directed their seizure.

According to the rules of international law, the burden was upon the belligerent seizing foodstuffs to prove that they were to be used by the army or navy of the opposing belligerent.

By this order Great Britain directed foodstuffs seized and confiscated when shipped to a neutral port if consigned to order, or to consignees in Germany, or if the ship's papers did not show who was the consignee of the goods, and also required the owners of the goods to prove that their destination was innocent.

It was a clear case of action by the privy council of Great Britain, which has authority to legislate upon this subject for that Government alone, setting up an illegal regulation to be enforced against the citizens of other nationalities in utter disregard of their rights under the rules of international law.

GREAT BRITAIN CONDEMNED BY HER OWN PRECEDENTS.

Again, I will rely upon English authority to show the lawlessness of this course pursued for more than 12 months past and still pursued by Great Britain.

In 1885 the French Government announced its intention of treating rice as contraband when destined to Chinese ports north of Canton.

Lord Granville, British foreign secretary, declared that the—British Government could not admit that provisions could be treated as contraband of war merely because they were consigned to a belligerent port. The British Government—

Said his lordship—

did not deny that provisions might acquire a contraband character under particular circumstances, as if they should be consigned directly to the fleet of a belligerent or to a port where such fleet was lying, but that there must, in any event, be circumstances relative to any particular cargo, or its destination, to displace the presumption that articles of this kind are intended for the ordinary use of life, and to show *prima facie*, at all events, that they are destined for military use, before they could be treated as contraband.

Lord Granville further stated:

His Majesty's Government feel themselves bound to reserve their right of protest at once against the doctrine that it is for the belligerent to decide what is and what is not contraband of war, regardless of the well-established rights of neutrals.

Lord Salisbury thus defined the position of His Majesty's Government on the question of foodstuffs:

Foodstuffs, with a hostile destination, can be considered contraband of war only if they are supplies for the enemy's forces. It is not sufficient that they are capable of being so used; it must be shown that this was in fact their destination at the time of the seizure.

When the Russian Government undertook during the Russo-Japanese war to treat foodstuffs as contraband, Lord Lansdowne protested that His Majesty's Government observed "with great concern that rice and provisions will be treated as unconditionally contraband, a step which they regard as inconsistent with the law and practice of nations. His Majesty's Government," said Lord Lansdowne, did not contest "that, in particular circumstances, provisions may acquire a contraband character, as, for instance, if they should be consigned direct to the army or fleet of a belligerent, or to a port where such fleet may be lying"; but that His Majesty's Government could not admit "that if such provisions were consigned to the port of a belligerent (even though it should be a port of naval equipment) they should therefore be necessarily regarded as contraband of war."

BRITISH STATESMEN SHOW FOODSTUFF SHOULD GO THROUGH NEUTRAL PORTS TO GERMANY.

During the debate in the House of Commons growing out of the action of Russia, Mr. Bryce, Sir Charles Dilke, and Mr. A. J. Balfour, spoke as follows:

MR. BRYCE. Food, by the general consent of nations, was not contraband of war unless it could be clearly proved to be intended for military or naval purposes. As one well-known authority had declared, it was unjustifiable so to treat it merely because of some uncertainty as to its ultimate destination.

SIR CHARLES DILKE. As regarded the attempt of Russia to treat food and raw material under all circumstances as contraband of war simply because they were destined for Japan, that was impossible for this country to accept.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR. I must express on my own behalf a general concurrence with the views on international law expressed by all of the honorable gentlemen who have spoken.

The Russian Government yielded.

ROYAL ENGLISH COMMISSION ON FOODSTUFFS.

The English Government appointed a royal commission in 1904 to consider the question of supply of food and raw material for Great Britain in time of war.

This commission consisted of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales and 20 other leading English statesmen.

Among other things, their report contained the following statements:

As regards foodstuffs, the rule of the British and United States prize courts is that which was most fully expounded by Lord Stowell in the case of the *Jonge Margaretha*. "I take," he said, "the modern established rule to be this, that generally they (provisions) are not contraband, but may become so under circumstances arising out of the particular situation of the war. * * * The most important distinction is whether the articles were intended for the ordinary use of life or even for mercantile ships' use or whether they were going with a highly probable destination to military use." Prof. Holland states as follows the rule which, in his opinion, has all but won its way to universal acceptance:

"Provisions in neutral ships may be intercepted by a belligerent as contraband only when, being suitable for the purpose, they are on their way to a port of naval or military equipment belonging to the enemy, or occupied by the enemy's naval or military forces, or to the enemy's ships at sea, or when they are destined for the relief of a port besieged by such belligerent."

It is, however, necessary to call attention to action taken by two powers on recent occasions not in accordance with the rule as thus stated. France in 1885 announced her intention of treating rice as contraband in her war with China, on the ground of its importance as food of the Chinese people and army, conduct the more remarkable because during the whole history of international law France had been distinguished by her refusal to admit the contraband character of provisions under any circumstances. The British Government protested, but, owing to the rapid termination of the war, the controversy was carried no further.

Russia, as has been already mentioned, at the commencement of the present war went so far as to include foodstuffs in her list of absolutely contraband articles, mentioning specifically "rice, all kinds of grain, fish, fish products, beans, bean oil, and oil cake." She has, however, receded from this position in consequence of strongly expressed protests from several of the powers, Great Britain and the United States in particular, and, in accordance with the advice of a commission presided over by Prof. de Martens, has undertaken that these articles will henceforth be regarded only as conditionally contraband, according to the use to which they are to be applied.

Lord Lansdowne's dispatch of June 1, 1904, stated that "His Majesty's Government observe with great concern that rice and provisions will be treated as unconditionally contraband, a step which they regard as inconsistent with the law and practice of nations." Mr. Hay's note of August 30, with reference to the judgment of Vladivostok prize court, confiscating as contraband the cargo of the *Arabia*, consisting of railway material and flour consigned to private commercial houses in Japan, spoke of that judgment as "rendered in disregard of the settled law of nations in respect of what constitutes contraband of war." He proceeds to state as "a substantive principle of the law of nations" that "articles which, like arms and ammunition, are by their nature of self-evident warlike use, are contraband if destined for the enemy's territory, but articles which, like coal, cotton, and provisions, though of ordinarily innocent, are capable of warlike use, are not subject to capture and confiscation unless shown by evidence to be actually destined for the military or naval forces of a belligerent. The Russian claim," he adds, "obliterates the necessity of blockade, renders meaningless the principles of the declaration of Paris that a blockade to be binding must be effective, obliterates all distinction between contraband and non-contraband goods, and is in effect a declaration of war against commerce of every description between the people of a neutral and those of a belligerent State."

The interest of neutral nations in the maintenance of international law (especially if the nation interested is strong enough to enforce its views) affords a further and increasingly potent guaranty of its being duly observed. It is, for instance, hardly to be expected that a neutral nation, if able to resent it, would tolerate the seizure as contraband of goods which had previously been recognized by international law as innocent. It should be remembered also that the nation which we should have the greatest reason to hope would be neutral, were Great Britain engaged in war, the United States of America, is also that which, in such a case, would be most interested in maintaining those neutral rights of which it has ever been the foremost advocate.

So it will be seen that Great Britain did not permit Russia to treat foodstuffs as subject to seizure simply because they were sailing to Japan when Russia was at war with Japan. They required Russia to show affirmatively that the particular foodstuffs were to be used by the army and navy of Japan, and not by the noncombatant population of Japan.

This could not be proved except in the rarest cases, so foodstuffs went to Japan, as Russia yielded to the British contention.

The United States took exactly the same position, and Russia also yielded to the view of the United States Government.

MR. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator to inquire whether or not, if the embargo were relieved as to foodstuffs, the Senator believes there would be any risk or danger in allowing foodstuffs to pass, arising from the possibility of including in such cargoes material that might be used for military purposes?

MR. SMITH of Georgia. That is a possibility. If it took place and the vessel were caught, the vessel and the cargo would be forfeited. If, in point of fact, they undertook to hide in a vessel sailing from the United States real contraband of war and they were caught, they would forfeit the ship and forfeit the goods. They would all be confiscated. That is the restriction against such reckless conduct.

I should be glad to have our inspectors at the ports see what is in the vessels and see that the manifest is true and publish it at once to the world. Give us our rights, nothing more; and give us our rights with an open hand. This would stop the possible illegal shipments suggested.

The House of Commons in 1911 had under consideration the declaration of London. The Government was urging its adoption. The opposition to the Government was opposing it.

The fight made upon the declaration by the opposition to the Government was principally because foodstuffs had not been put upon the free list where no belligerent could ever make them contraband of any character.

Mr. McKinnon Wood was undersecretary of state in charge of the debate for the Government. I will give a number of interesting expressions during that debate from members of Parliament, now leaders in Great Britain, which show how utterly Great Britain is disregarding the rights of neutrals and how fully these British leaders know that the rights of neutrals in the treatment of foodstuffs are being disregarded.

Mr. McKinnon Wood. * * * We tried at the peace conference to have food placed on the free list. We could not secure an approach to international agreement. The declaration of London places it on the list, in accordance with the old-established British doctrine—or, at any rate, our doctrine for a long time now. * * *

Mr. McKenna. * * * He admits, and I admit with him, that in general practice food has only been conditional contraband, the condition depending upon whether it was intended for the armed forces of the enemy. * * * The declaration of London declares that food may become contraband under precisely these conditions. * * *

Sir Edward Grey. * * * If food is to be declared absolute contraband, so that all food coming to any commercial port is to be stopped by a belligerent, the belligerent can only do that by driving a coach and four through what is the plain meaning of the declaration of London.

It will be observed that Mr. McKinnon Wood had stated that the provision of the declaration of London was in accordance with the old-established British doctrine—that is to say, the rule of international law—with reference to foodstuffs long recognized by Great Britain.

Sir Edward Grey, therefore, declares that a belligerent could only stop all food going to a commercial port by driving a "coach and four" through the plain meaning of "the old-established British doctrine."

Mr. Balfour. * * * There are great continental countries which habitually import such corn as they require through neutral ports. They can not be touched under this declaration. * * * The old practice and the old theory were that it was only when corn was actually being obviously imported for the use of soldiers or ports of equipment or the use of fortresses that then, and then only, we had any right to treat it as contraband. * * *

It will be observed that Mr. Balfour declared that under the old theory—that is to say, the established rules of international law—corn (foodstuffs) could only be treated as contraband—that is to say, seized by a belligerent—when it was being imported for the use of soldiers or ports of equipment or a fortress.

Great Britain has seized foodstuffs belonging to citizens of the United States and has confiscated them simply because it was claimed that they were going to Germany. Not that they were going for the use of the soldiers, but because they were going to Germany, even though they were to be used by the non-combatant population of Germany.

Mr. Balfour is to-day secretary of the navy of Great Britain.

Mr. Bonar Law. They have to prove, as we have to prove, that food is destined for the armed forces of the other side.

Mr. Bonar Law is one of the leading statesmen of Great Britain, and he declares that food can only be stopped when Great Britain proves that it is destined for the armed forces of Germany.

Mr. Gallinger. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. Smith of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. Gallinger. And in contravention of that rule, if I read the matter correctly, Great Britain has placed an embargo upon the exportation of milk to the babies of Germany at the present time.

Mr. Smith of Georgia. Absolutely.

Mr. Gallinger. They must be noncombatants.

Mr. Smith of Georgia. Unquestionably. The truth is, Senators, we all know that Germany has provided her army with all the foodstuffs it needs. The resources of that country are ample for the army, and everybody knows the army will be cared for first. This interference with foodstuffs does not touch the army.

Great Britain is seizing foodstuffs simply because it is going to Germany, and seizes it going to a neutral port, unless the neutral citizen owning it can prove that it is not going to Germany.

During the debate in Commons in 1911 the following statements were made:

Mr. Atherly Jones. What is the law, and let the right honorable gentleman, the undersecretary, correct me if I am not stating the law aright. When I speak of law, it has no sanction except that of usage. It is a mere custom of law, but it has very powerful sanction. It has this powerful sanction that the common sense of Europe has justified the law, and justified it so far that it has never, except in one or two extravagant cases, been violated. The law is that foodstuffs, unless car-

ried to a port of naval or military equipment, can not be seized—I mean foodstuffs in neutral vessels. That is absolutely unequivocal, and I think unanimously recognized to be the law of Europe.

Mr. Atherly Jones is one of the most distinguished law writers in Great Britain. He declares that foodstuffs can not be seized unless being carried to a port of naval or military equipment of Germany.

Mr. Butcher. I think my honorable friend who has spoken has laid down the law with absolute clearness when he said that the general modern practice of nations for a hundred years has been to treat food not as contraband, liable to seizure in any circumstance, but as conditional contraband, liable to seizure only when it is proved to be intended for the armed force of the enemy. We have the opinion of one undersecretary to-night; let me read the opinion of another Liberal undersecretary for foreign affairs, a man whose authority as a jurist and a statesman none of us would dispute. I refer to the Right Hon. James Bryce. He said, from his place in this House, on August 11, 1904: "Food, by the general consent of the nations, was not contraband unless it was clearly proved to be intended for military or naval purposes."

Does the right honorable gentleman dispute the accuracy of the statement of Mr. Bryce? It has gone unchallenged in the House of Commons until to-day, and not a single jurist or anyone else has challenged it until it was challenged by the undersecretary this afternoon.

Mr. Butcher is a distinguished English statesman and law writer. He indorses the view of Viscount James Bryce that food could only be seized when clearly proved to be intended for military or naval purposes.

Mr. Shirley Benn. One case in which a country tried to starve another country into submission was our own case, in 1795, when that celebrated order in council was issued instructing British cruisers to capture all vessels going into any French port that had food supplies on board. Our captains captured some, but what was the result? The United States complained that it was not legal, and the matter was left to a mixed commission, and that commission decided that it was not legal, and England had to pay not only for the value of the goods but also for the loss of market and detention. The second case was the one referred to in the House this afternoon, when France, in her war with China, declared that any rice going to any port north of Canton should be considered as contraband. What was the result? Lord Granville, the Liberal foreign minister, promptly issued a proclamation to the effect that no decision of a prize court carrying out such a doctrine would be recognized by England, and the result was that it was not carried out.

Mr. Shirley Benn, another prominent English statesman, not only agrees with those to whom I have already referred, but he further concedes the fact that, when in 1795 British cruisers seized a vessel of the United States carrying foodstuffs, solely because it was going into a French port, France being then engaged in war with Great Britain, the case was left to a mixed commission, and this commission decided that the seizure was illegal, and England not only had to pay the value of the goods, but for the loss of market and detention.

I wish, however, to read a few extracts from one of the speeches made on the floor of Parliament in 1911. It is from Sir Robert Finlay. After showing that foodstuffs could go to a neutral nation without molestation and that they could go to a belligerent port without molestation unless they were shown to be intended for the army or navy of the belligerent, he then concludes in this way. Just listen—

Mr. Colt. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. Smith of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. Colt. I have listened with great interest to the argument of the Senator from Georgia, and I should like to ask him whether he does not think that, as the rules of municipal law are suspended in time of war, so the rules of international law are in part suspended by a belligerent in time of war; that a nation at war is in a fever or delirium where so-called rules of law, which may be made in times of peace, seem of comparatively little consequence compared with the great issue of preserving the national life; and hence that belligerents will seize upon any ambiguity in an international rule or upon any forced construction in order that they may in fact suspend the rule; and that the great defect in international law is that nations at war will not obey rules of conduct agreed to in times of peace?

Mr. Smith of Georgia. Mr. President and Senators, nations, like men, are likely to be lawless if they see no danger to themselves from being lawless. Nations in times of war may be disposed to disregard law if there is no power to call them and make them regard it. But we saw in the Russo-Japanese War the power of Great Britain to call Russia when she desired by a municipal regulation to set aside international law. Russia was called, and she came back to the law. And so it may be to-day that the lawless in Great Britain have intimidated the believers in law and persuaded them to issue these illegal municipal regulations. It needs but the power of the United States, as the great neutral, to assert the rights of neutrals, and we will find the great statesmen of England glad to come back in the conduct of English affairs to the recognition of those rules of international law that they have contributed so much to create.

Now, let me read to you, from an English statesman, his opinion of what Great Britain could rely upon. I want the Senator from Rhode Island to hear what the English statesman thought Great Britain could rely upon to see that the rules of international law were enforced if Great Britain was at war. It had been suggested that while the rules of international law gave the privilege of these shipments of raw materials and foodstuffs, some other belligerent might wish to violate them. Now, let me show you where Great Britain put her reliance that the rules of international law would be enforced that would give her the supplies she needed. I read from Sir Robert Finlay, near the close of the debate upon the declaration of London in 1909:

Sir R. FINLAY. The law of conditional contraband is perfectly clear. It has always been held in this country, it has always been held in the United States, and it has been laid down authoritatively that food is contraband only if it is for the army or the fleet, and is in consequence of that part of naval or military equipment. A very able writer on international law, Mr. Hall, says the opposite view is not arguable, and a right honorable gentleman of considerable authority in these matters to whom honorable gentlemen on the other side might be disposed to listen, Mr. Bryce, our ambassador at Washington, expressed himself on this subject on the 11th of August, 1904, in a debate in the house in these terms:

"Food, by the general consent of nations, was not contraband of war unless it is clearly proved to be for military or naval purposes. In 1885 an attempt was made by France to treat rice as contraband of war. Lord Granville protested in the most energetic manner, and in point of fact rice never was treated as contraband of war."

That authority is one which, I think, is amply borne out by a more extended view of the law on this point, into which on this occasion I do not intend, of course, to enter.

Will any honorable gentleman say that any power at war with us would be likely to provoke the displeasure of the United States by declaring that corn carried in a United States vessel to this country should be absolute contraband of war? Not only is the law on the matter clear, but it has behind it, so far as we are concerned, a sanction of the most effective kind, for happily, I think, we may dismiss the very idea of the possibility of war between this country and the United States as not within the range of practical politics, and as long as we are not at war with the United States we may depend upon it that no country, however powerful, would incur the displeasure and the possible hostility of such a power as the United States by putting forward an unfounded claim to treat food brought to this country as contraband of war.

This exposition by Sir R. Finlay needs little comment. He told the British Parliament, in 1911, that no country, however powerful, would incur the displeasure, and possible hostility, of such a power as the United States by putting forward an unfounded claim to treat food brought to Great Britain as contraband of war.

I wonder what he thinks of the United States now, when we submit not only to the seizure of vessels destined to German ports carrying foodstuffs, but to the seizure of vessels destined to neutral ports of Holland and Sweden and permit Great Britain, disregarding rules of international law, by orders from the privy council, which must be followed by her prize courts, to confiscate cargoes of foodstuffs belonging to citizens of the United States with no proof whatever that they were intended for the military or naval forces of Germany?

Germany and Austria have a population of over 110,000,000 people. It is estimated that perhaps 10 per cent of these are under arms. Certainly over 90,000,000 people in these two countries are noncombatants.

By every rule of international law citizens of the United States have the right to ship to these noncombatants for their use, through the neutral ports of northern Europe, all the foodstuffs they wish to buy. The same is equally true of raw cotton.

Raw cotton is the great commodity used to clothe the world. So that Great Britain is suppressing the shipment of foodstuffs and clothing to the noncombatant population of her enemy, in utter defiance of established rules of international law, in utter defiance of rules which all of her present statesmen have within the past five years declared to be the correct rules of international law, and rules which they insist Great Britain, in case of war, could safely rely upon, because the United States would not permit them to be broken.

Only a partial knowledge of German and Austrian resources will convince all that these countries have ample internal resources to produce foodstuffs and clothing to fully supply the men under arms.

They will also supply the noncombatants to an extent which may bring pinches from want, but will not destroy. To this there may be one exception—young children may die for lack of milk.

Great Britain can not hope to accomplish anything so far as the immediate effect of the war is concerned by this lawlessness. We may find a reason for their course so far as cotton is concerned. The manufacture and exportation of cotton fabrics has been a great industry in Germany. The marvelous skill of these people as mechanics, their superiority as chemists have

made markets in the world for their manufactured products which have seriously encroached upon English commerce.

If cotton can be kept out of Germany and the exports from Germany suppressed, then perhaps England may capture this trade and help her own commerce.

PRESIDENT LONDON BOARD OF TRADE DEFINES POSITION.

The frankness with which the president of the London Board of Trade, in a speech before the House of Commons on January 9, proclaimed the purposes of Great Britain almost staggers comprehension.

Let me give a few extracts. He declared that—

England will assault Germany's trade now and after the war. * * * We must keep control of the world's coal; we must secure control of the supply of oil. While the war is on we must do everything in our power to destroy German finance, credit, and trade * * * so that after the war Germany does not have the opportunity of reorganizing her commercial system before our trade has begun to flow in ever-increasing volume. * * * We must make it clear, however, that when peace comes we will not permit the outbreak of the economic war which Germany would wage against herself and our allies. * * * It has been all along the policy of the board of trade to capture German trade while the war is still on. In the case of South America, we have since the war begun developed a trade which, I hope, will continue long after the cessation of hostilities.

In the course of the debate there were some references to the danger of competition with the United States, to which John Halford Mackinder replied:

The member has spoken of America as a dangerous commercial rival, but I can not conceive of that competition taking the complex, scientific, and destructive form of Germany's competition.

On the day following this speech cable reports advised us that—

Insertion of a clause in the peace agreement binding Germany to refrain from all export business for a period of years is one of the methods suggested by British trade experts to cripple German trade after the war. Leading London business men generally approved the statement made by President Walter Runciman, of the board of trade, in commons last night that Great Britain must so cripple German commerce that the Germans can not again dispute world supremacy with the British nation.

The commercial rights of citizens of the United States and of other neutrals are being recklessly disregarded by Great Britain. They are being disregarded in part to destroy Germany commercially and in part to advance the trade of Great Britain.

Shall we quietly continue to furnish Great Britain what she is compelled to obtain from the United States while the commercial rights of citizens of this country are trampled under foot?

Great Britain can not continue the war without munitions from the United States.

Great Britain can not feed her population without foodstuffs from the United States and other neutrals.

Great Britain can not keep her million and a half people engaged in the Lancashire mills at work 60 days without cotton from the United States.

Great Britain can not accomplish her scheme for world-wide domination of commerce in her vast products of cotton-manufactured fabrics without cotton from the United States.

The administration has forcefully brought to the attention of Great Britain the rights of citizens of this country.

It has been demonstrated that citizens of neutral countries have the right to ship foodstuffs and cotton in unlimited quantities through the neutral ports of northern Europe to the non-combatant inhabitants of Germany and Austria.

The Congress of the United States slept over the right of shippers of foodstuffs last winter. This was perhaps because the prices were good, perhaps because we did not investigate the subject.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUSTING in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Idaho? Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. Does not the Senator think that Great Britain, of course, realizing that she can not carry on her war without munitions from the United States, and foodstuffs, and so forth, also understands that the United States will not forego the business opportunity of supplying those things to Great Britain, and that therefore she does not feel uneasy about the situation?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. She may think that is true, and she may think that these influences are so great that the United States would not, but she knows that we could do without shipments for 60 or 90 days, and she can not. She knows that we would be suspending profits while she would be going to absolute ruin. One word further, she knows that we are right and that she is wrong.

Mr. BORAH. But she understands, of course, that she is fighting for her existence and that we are unwilling to deny ourselves the opportunity which that situation presents.

I am delighted to hear the Senator's argument, but it is a practical question. Does the Senator believe that by any possibility we could pass through the Congress of the United States an inhibition against or an embargo upon the shipment of those things which Great Britain needs?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If I could have the support of the able Senator from Idaho, I would be glad to join him in passing such a provision—to go into effect in 30 days, unless Great Britain in the meantime receded from her orders in council and recognized our rights of international law.

Mr. BORAH. That would make two.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Here is another.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. With the support of the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Arkansas we could well hope for the balance.

Mr. BORAH. I think I can, in the Senate, count five or six.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I can count a good many more than that on this side.

Mr. BORAH. Then let us get to business; decide what it is wise and just to do.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then let the Senator from Idaho give me one of his splendid speeches in support of this policy and we will go hand and shoulder together. I am simply presenting suggestions for the thought of the Senate now. I am seeking to lay the rights of our countrymen and the power of our country before you, and if the Senator from Idaho is ready to join I am more encouraged by that fact than by anything I have heard.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I manifested my disposition as to the shipment of munitions of war last year when the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] introduced his resolution. I will say to the Senator that I am perfectly willing, as a Senator, to take action both with reference to protecting our rights upon the sea and upon the land, on the ocean and in Mexico. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to assume the responsibility not of speech but of action. I have but one guide in these matters—the interests, rights, and safety of Americans. I am neither anti-English nor anti-German. Wherever American rights are invaded, American property destroyed, or American lives sacrificed, I am willing to proceed to action along any wise and effective line which will insure a recognition or respect of those rights and protection to the lives of our people. I realize that such things require reflection, but I have reflected and I am willing to vote upon effective measures now.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I can not say how gratified I am to hear the expression of the Senator from Idaho. I had not heard it from him before, but I am not surprised. It is what I would expect from him, with my estimate of him as a man and a Senator.

The lawlessness of Great Britain has increased greatly during the past 12 months. Each day brings new evidence of disregard for neutral rights.

By firmness, but peacefully, neutrals can easily obtain their rights from both belligerents.

Paraphrasing the language of Mr. Jefferson, England may feel the desire of absorbing the commerce of Germany and of starving her people, but she can have no right of doing it at our loss or of making us the instrument of it.

Mr. President, I am in favor of enforcing our rights against all the belligerent nations. I am in favor of action by Congress which will let the belligerents understand that unless our rights are promptly regarded we will act, and such knowledge in London as the expressions of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] going to London will help those men in London who believe in the law. They will help bring a rescission from the illegal orders in council, for when they know that we are in earnest they must stop and think, and then return to the principles which they have so long advocated, and which they must find no pleasure to set aside.

APPENDIX.

ABSCHEFT CENTRALSTELLE FÜR
WISSENSCHAFTLICH-TECHNISCHE
UNTERSUCHUNGEN, G. M. B. H.,
Neubabelsberg, den 3. Dez. 1915.

HOWARD W. BIBLE, Esq.,
Hotel Adlon, Berlin.

SIR: An interesting chapter in the history of chemical industry will be the account of the technical achievements which have been produced during this great war.

Ever since the chemist Leblanc under the pressure of the continental blockade effected the manufacture of soda from cooking salt in France, the problem has often been solved in Germany of also making her independent of other countries by the manufacture of hitherto indispensable foreign products from native raw materials. Never, however, has the great creative power of chemical research

been so in evidence as in the course of this war in which the enemies of the central powers aim to conquer them by cutting off their supply of imported raw materials. Such materials which we used to import by sea in time of peace we now manufacture from the air surrounding us, from the water, and our native soil to an extent that makes us absolutely independent of other countries. Problems, the solution of which still seemed an impossibility only a few years ago, such as the manufacture of nitrogen products from the air, have matured to accomplished facts in the chemist's laboratory.

Therefore it seems astonishing that even learned scientists of foreign countries who are regarded as experts in the field of chemical research consider problems which we have long since solved as impossible of solution. Thus it is surprising when the opinion is expressed among well-known chemists in England that to shut off her supply of cotton could destroy Germany's defensive power, even force her to conclude peace within a few months because the lack of cotton would make the manufacture of the required amount of gunpowder impossible, and thus put us at the mercy of our enemies who were not hampered by such restrictions. (Ramsay, Times, Dec. 8, 1915: "Stop cotton and we should stop the war.")

Is that really the opinion of this scientist? Does he not know what every expert in explosives should know, that cotton cellulose, as used in the manufacture of ammunition, can in every respect be replaced by wood cellulose, an unlimited supply of which is always on hand in Germany? In time of peace Mr. Ramsay had ample opportunity to become acquainted with a large part of the German chemical industry. Does he really underestimate it so much that he does not consider it able to turn wood cellulose into a form in which it can be used instead of cotton for the manufacture of gunpowder?

It is true that a much more extensive cleaning of wood cellulose is necessary, if the existing machinery is to be used, and no time lost nor any more nitric acid consumed. It was necessary to give the manufacturers of cellulose some instruction in regard to the chemical and physical requirements of the product. But the fulfillment of these requirements presented no difficulty. The manufacture of nitrocellulose from wood fiber and its conversion into gunpowder, which is absolutely on a par with that made from cotton in respect of its durability and its ballistic properties, had long been solved in all its details in our laboratories. It had only to be transferred from the laboratory to the factories, which was not difficult, thanks to the expert knowledge of the chemists in the factories. Thus wood cellulose is since considerable time being used on a vast scale by the plants in the manufacture of nitrocellulose. The need for raw cotton is no longer felt in our gunpowder industry. The capacity of our cellulose factories exceeds many times the demand for cellulose for nitrating purposes.

After the war the world will learn of many great new achievements which our chemical industry had to and was able to accomplish in order to protect our German fatherland against all the efforts of the enemy to cut off its supply of food and ammunition. Many of these products will continue after the war is over. Even in times of peace they will be valuable in making us independent of foreign raw materials.

It looks very much as if the successes achieved by the cellulose industry will be among these.

Dr. W. WILL,

Professor at the University of Berlin;

Director of the Central Bureau for Technico-Scientific Research.

JANUARY 7, 1916.

HON. HOKE SMITH,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Last October while in Washington I stated to you that during my visits to Germany, in the months of June, July, August, and September, 1915, I had been assured that cotton was no longer used in and no longer, in any sense, essential for, the manufacture of powder or explosives in Germany. As I was intending to return to Germany in November, I agreed to make a personal investigation of this subject and give you the results of that investigation. I also agreed that as soon as I reached a conclusion I would wire you, and I agreed with you upon a code to be used, in which the word "commodity" was to be substituted for the word "cotton" and the name "John Thomson" signed to the wire instead of my own. In pursuance of that agreement on December 4, 1915, after a full investigation of the subject in Germany, I sent you the following wireless message:

"Absolute evidence that commodity is not required. Substitute more effective, cheaper, and preferred for future use."

(Signed)

JOHN THOMSON.

Before sending this message I had made a most careful and unrestricted investigation of the present method of the manufacture of powder and explosives in Germany, and I satisfied myself that wood cellulose had been successfully substituted for cotton in the nitrating plants of Germany.

I reached Bremen November 28 and brought my desire for a personal investigation upon this subject at once to the attention of those largely interested in handling cotton in the Empire. I transmitted to them your request for information along the lines indicated, and they at once extended their cooperation and influence with the German Government in order that the facts might be secured.

A series of meetings were held in Bremen, and on Tuesday, December 1, President Alfred Lohman, of the Bremen Chamber of Commerce, accompanied me to Berlin for the purpose of presenting the case before the several departments of German Government, whose consent was necessary before the facts could be obtained and the necessary investigation conducted. It was arranged that I should appear before a meeting in Berlin, where the representatives of the several departments of the Government would be assembled to hear the presentation of your request that this information be furnished, and to determine whether or not it was to the interests of the German Government to comply therewith.

This meeting was held at the imperial foreign office December 3 at 5.30 p. m. It was recognized as a purely commercial matter, one involving the business interests of the United States and the German Empire, and was not regarded as an infraction of diplomatic usage.

There were present His Excellency Unterstaatssekretär Richter, Ministerial Director Müller, Geheimrat Dr. Mathies, department of Interior; Ministerial Director Johannes, Geheimrat Dr. Grunewald, imperial foreign office; Rittmeister Markwald, war department; Geheimrat Dr. Stimming, finance department; Captain Trapp and a scientific doctor, navy department; Alfred Lohman, president of the Bremen Chamber of Commerce.

These gentlemen gave the strictest attention to the subject of our several interviews and the correspondence that passed between us rela-

tive to the unlawful restriction placed upon cotton, which I presented at considerable length, placing particular emphasis upon the value of proof that cotton was in no wise an essential element to the progress of the war as a necessity for the manufacture of explosives.

At the conclusion of my remarks I was assured by all present that cotton was no longer used or necessary in Germany for the manufacture of powder or explosives, and that the German Government would gladly extend to me every facility for securing such proof as I deemed necessary, and which might be obtained by a careful inspection of the manufacture of explosives in one or more plants operated by the Imperial Government, the selection of such plant or plants being left entirely to me. I was given an outline of where the principal powder plants were located adjacent to Berlin and authorized to select for inspection any I might prefer. I decided on the morning of December 4 to inspect the *Kemiglichen Munitionsfabriken* at Spandau. Accompanied by President Lohman, I reached the above plant about 10 a. m. The inspection of the various departments was at once begun, and we were accompanied in this inspection by the commanding officer of the works, Maj. Gorke, of the German Army, and Mr. von der Bocks, *Königlicher Betriebsleiter der Technischen Instituten der Artillerie*.

The fullest access was given to all processes of the nitrating of cotton and cellulose and a notable freedom of investigation was a feature of our visit to this plant. We first inspected the warehouses utilized for the storing of the raw material for nitrating. The first warehouse visited was entered by a railroad track with platforms on either side, and bales of wood cellulose were at the time being unloaded from freight cars. I made a careful inspection of the entire platforms on either side and found nothing there but wood cellulose and rags. Going among this stock, I directed that several bales should be opened and samples of wood cellulose were secured from the following manufacturers:

1. Altdamm—Stahlhammer (Natronezellstoff).
2. Sulphide cellulose of the cellulose manufactory, Waldhof-Mannheim.
3. Sulphide cellulose of the A. G. für Maschinenpapier-fabrikation, Aschaffenburg.

4. Sulphide cellulose of the cellulose manufactory at Tilsit. We then secured samples of nitrating material from rags. These samples were marked with the manufacturers' names—"Jackson" and "Breitenau." Absolutely no cotton linters were found upon this level of the warehouse and only a few bales were in evidence on the upper floor. These had been in stock for some time and were placed at one side, having been definitely rejected in favor of the use of wood cellulose and rags.

In regard to the rags, would say that all evidence pointed to their early elimination as a material for nitrating. In fact, the incoming supplies were apparently confined to wood cellulose, and there was no evidence to support a contention that dependence was being placed on rags. Leaving the warehouses, we proceeded to the buildings which were employed for the use of drying nitrocellulose and rags. The two commodities were placed in small perforated iron receptacles, which were closely packed and passed to the drying process. A careful inspection of work under way disclosed a large preponderance of wood cellulose, as compared to rags. The work in this department was entirely done by women and girls. In passing from the drying building, we entered the departments where nitrating was in progress and inspected three houses devoted exclusively to the nitrating of wood cellulose and one devoted entirely to the nitrating of rags.

In all of these houses I made a careful inspection of the tanks, causing several to be opened and obtaining therefrom absolute evidence of the use of wood cellulose or rags, as the case might be. Furthermore, I examined the pipe conveyers and ascertained the contents thereof, and in each case found it to be as stated—either wood cellulose or rags. Proceeding from the nitrating department, we came to the washing department, where the nitrated material is washed, and again I made a careful inspection of the contents of the washing tanks and confirmed the use of wood cellulose or rags. Passing from this department, we entered the building where grinding was in progress, and I ascertained beyond all doubt the nature of the materials so treated. The wood cellulose or rags was then re washed, which concluded the process of preparation (and proved conclusively that no difference existed, whether the gun cotton was prepared from linters, rags, or wood cellulose). During the process of this investigation special attention was directed to the easy absorbing capacity of the wood cellulose, and it was stated that wood cellulose contained when nitrated an especially high amount of nitrate (more than 13 per cent). On account of the cleanness of the wood cellulose the finished powder is especially described "beständig"—that is, immune against decomposition. In the nature of cost, wood cellulose was declared to be one-third less than the price of linters. Before proceeding to the commercial effect of the restriction in the movement of cotton upon the future I would call attention to an illustration of effect of ignition upon nitrated materials, namely, rags and wood cellulose.

Quantities of both of these materials, after nitrating, were taken from the buildings and placed upon the ground at some distance and there ignited by alcohol, no real difference being discernible between the action of the explosive force of the rags and wood cellulose. The nature of flame, response, character of smoke thrown off, and duration of action seemed identical. Later I was shown a similar demonstration in the smokeless powder derived from both materials, and again could find no difference. I merely state this as an instance of observation, for I am not in a position to give any technical information of value in the matter of witnessing such explosions. The illustration came about through the repeated statements that the forces of the allies could determine the difference in the character of ammunition used. This is said to be beyond the range of human possibility by explosive experts with whom I have discussed the matter, and is borne out by these demonstrations.

During the inspection of the Spandau Works, the following interesting facts were gleaned from Maj. Gorke and other officers, namely, that: Prior to August, 1914, all gunpowder and explosives were produced from saltpeter nitrogen, manufactured from saltpeter imported from Chile; that cotton linters prior to that date were exclusively used, and were mostly imported from the United States; that until seven years ago camphor, an essential part in the manufacture of explosives, was imported from Japan. The high price of camphor then induced German chemical manufacturers to produce synthetic camphor, which was manufactured to a great extent by the use of turpentine oil. The turpentine oil was an American product and large quantities, running into the millions of dollars in value, were imported for this purpose. The stoppage of this exportation from America by Great Britain compelled the German chemists to seek for a new substitute, and synthetic camphor is produced

to-day from another material, which is considerably cheaper than turpentine and more effective than Japanese camphor. It is therefore shown that the German ammunition manufacturers have successfully solved all important questions, and that within the German domain is contained all necessary materials. At this time Germany is supplying, to a large extent, the ammunition demands of Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, and Turkey, and has several months' reserves on hand for the necessities of most stringent warfare.

The losers by Great Britain's action are therefore:

First, Chile, two-thirds of whose saltpeter production, prior to the outbreak of war, found its way to Germany, for with the establishment of an industry for the production of nitrogen from the air, at a cost of 100,000,000 marks, this product will hereafter be supplied by Germany, and a saving has already been effected, for the price of Chilean saltpeter compared with German saltpeter is 9 as against 7 marks. This not only enables Germany to meet her own demands after the conclusion of war, but to become a competitor with Chile in the markets of the world.

Second, America, from whose cotton fields almost all the linters used in the manufacture of gunpowder and explosives were supplied. Now, in times of war and peace this demand is entirely removed, for the solution of the cellulose problem enables Germany to effect a considerable saving in cost and will lead, upon the conclusion of peace, to the elimination of linters from the manufacture of explosives.

Third, America, from whom supplies of turpentine oil were obtained at a cost of many millions of marks through the enforced substitution of a commodity created by necessity and claimed to be the superior of this American natural product.

In the matter of cotton holdings, it can be definitely stated that there is an ample sufficiency in hand to meet all military demands for the next three years, such as uniforms, hospital supplies, and other purposes. The same is said to be the case with wool, and one thing is certain, namely, that large purchases of wool and cotton in Turkey were made by the newly formed *Deutsch-Orientalische Handelsgesellschaft*, of which Mr. Alfred Lohman is president.

Returning to the question of the use of wood cellulose as a component part of manufacture of explosives, I would direct attention to the fact that 49 manufacturers' plants are engaged in the manufacture of wood pulp in the German Empire, and as a part of this report I submit a list of the names and locations of these plants.

I would furthermore direct attention to the fact that wood cellulose is used in explosives in the same relative manner as is cotton, namely, as a propellant; that the extent to which cotton has been used in this connection does not justify the statements so frequently circulated since the cotton question became an acute war issue.

Without the use of cellulose or rags there is a sufficiency of linters in German Government hands, but with the solution brought about by the perfection of wood pulp within the past 60 days a large amount of Government-owned linters have been released for industrial demands, and I saw at one place 3,000 bales of linters which were released by the Government to manufacturers because not required for military purposes. Careful inquiries from every source of knowledge at my command, namely, observation in the zones of activity, the statements of military authorities, the reports of the war press representatives, and the first-hand knowledge of civilians who have witnessed the passage of supplies to the various parts of the front, convinced me that there has been no necessity for a change in the manufacture of guns; that the wood cellulose propellant is of equal strength to the cotton propellant; that the rifling of the large arms of the service as well as the small weapons does not demand a change due to the difference of propellents in explosives, the same firing chamber being used to equal advantage.

I directed my investigations in these channels as far as possible not only on this present trip to Germany, but upon the numerous occasions which have presented themselves since the war began and which carried me to many parts of Germany and Belgium and the regions of military activities. One prominent attaché assured me that throughout his entire observation of German military progress, artillery was employed with the greatest freedom, and that at no time was there any scarcity of shells nor evidence of a varied nature of explosives employed. In concluding my report upon this important and far-reaching subject, I desire to note my interest in the matter by stating that I have absolutely no affiliation nor connection with any company or individual, either American, German, or of other nationality, who is engaged in or would profit by the movement of cotton from the United States to Germany. My interest in this matter is wholly political, for I feel that the Southern States have been deprived unfairly of one of their greatest markets; that the British Government has been forced against its will to act in bad faith by making cotton contraband; that certain Liverpool interests, actuated by purely financial reasons, were behind the false statements which developed into a preconceived campaign of misrepresentation as to the use of cotton for explosives; that is the extent to which cotton can be employed. For this reason I secured an opinion from Prof. Will, of the University of Berlin, and I am pleased to submit his letter of December 3, 1915, bearing on this subject. I will add that my real interest in seeing a restoration of commerce, guaranteed by the law of nations between Germany and the United States, comes through my desire to bring about a movement of dyestuffs from Germany to the United States. Having been instrumental in the securing of supplies of these important materials from Germany during the autumn and winter of 1914, I have closely followed the possibilities of providing American industries and labor with such essentials, and I find to-day that we are facing a serious industrial problem, which can only be overcome by a speedy solution of the commercial relations between Germany and the United States.

Very respectfully, yours,

HOWARD W. BIBLE.

During the delivery of the speech of Mr. SMITH of Georgia, The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia.

After the conclusion of the speech of Mr. SMITH of Georgia, Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, this war has been prolific on the part of all the belligerents of violations of the rules of inter-

national law as we have understood it heretofore. The Senator from Georgia deserves great credit for calling attention to the manner in which the British Government in one way or another has violated the rules of international law in respect to American commerce. Most of our commerce during the war has filtered into or through the little neutral countries of northern Europe—Holland, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway. Most of the commerce which has been held up by the British orders in council has been commerce and traffic plying to those countries.

Now, while in no manner justified, on the contrary I entirely agree with the conclusions reached by the Senator from Georgia in respect to the conduct of Great Britain, yet in this connection I want to present to the Senate another side of the picture. There are those four little countries that I have referred to in northern Europe. I have a list in my hand here of the number of merchant ships of those countries which have been sunk by German submarine boats and German mines since the war began up to the 14th of this month, and the list is perfectly startling. These are merchant vessels, traders. I will say that I have compiled this list from the leading commercial newspapers of the city of New York that have from day to day published an account.

The total number of vessels sunk by submarines, mines, and by warships—the latter being only one—is 134. One hundred and three have been sunk by German submarines, 30 have been sunk by mines, some of them German and perhaps some of them English, and 1 was sunk by a war vessel.

I have been able in this list to give the names of the vessels and to give the date when they were torpedoed or sunk. It appears from this list of 134 vessels that the total number of Dutch ships sunk is 11, the total number of Danish ships sunk is 15, the total number of Swedish ships sunk is 27, and the total number of Norwegian ships sunk is 51.

As I said the other day, since the German merchant marine has been eliminated from ocean traffic most of the trade traffic is carried on by our own ships, some by the English, and to a large extent by these neutrals.

I am unable to give in this list the tonnage of all the vessels. In some instances the tonnage has been given. Neither am I able to give a list of the people who have been destroyed when the ships were sunk, but it is a horrible record. In many instances many of the poor sailors, the crews on these vessels, have perished by reason of the submarines.

Now, there is this difference, to which I want to call the Senator's attention, between the British method and the German method. The British have held up our ships, taken them into port, searched their cargo and taken out what they conceived to be improper and either confiscated it or commandeered it, but in the main they have let the ships go; they have not destroyed the ships. The Germans have not only destroyed the cargo but they have destroyed the ships, and in many instances they have killed the crews on these vessels.

Of course these four little neutral countries of Holland, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden are, in the face of these great powers, helpless. They have to submit to this treatment. I bring this to the attention of the Senate in order that when the great country of the United States intervenes in this matter it will see to it that the traffic of these neutral countries is protected—protected not only in the interest of our commerce, but in the interest of fair play to these neutral nations.

Just think of it, 134 vessels destroyed, mainly by German submarines, since the war commenced.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Can the Senator give us the locality of those vessels, where they were principally?

Mr. NELSON. I can not give the locality. It has been done along the Norwegian and Swedish and Danish coast and the Holland coast in nearly every instance. I will say, in addition to that list, there are a great many Scandinavian vessels that have been taken into German ports, and have been condemned in their prize courts. There have been two or three instances where German warships have seized Swedish vessels within Sweden's territorial waters. One occurred a short time ago. They finally released it.

So, Mr. President, without intending to take up the time of the Senate any further, in view of the able speech of the Senator from Georgia, and in view of the fact that he presented one side of this picture of interfering with neutral rights, I felt it incumbent on me to present the other side of it, that the people of this country may see just what has transpired.

Mr. President, I ask that this list may be incorporated, without reading, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUSTING in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The list referred to is as follows:

Data concerning the sinking of neutral vessels belonging to the northern neutral nations, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Holland, and which were sunk by belligerents engaged in the present European war by means of submarines, mines, or warships between the dates Aug. 1, 1914, and Jan. 14, 1916.

Nationality.	Tonnage.	Sunk by—	Name.	Date of sinking.
Norwegian.....	1,507	Submarine....	Pluton.....	Aug. 1, 1914-Feb. 1915.
Do.....		Mine.....	Gottfried.....	Aug. 27, 1914.
Do.....		do.....	Hesvik.....	Sept. 23, 1914.
Do.....		do.....	Tromo.....	Oct. 14, 1914.
Do.....		do.....	Vaaren.....	Dec. 17, 1914.
Do.....		do.....	Boston.....	Dec. 22, 1914.
Do.....		do.....	Ell.....	Dec. 25, 1914.
Do.....		do.....	Castor.....	Jan. 10, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Bjerka.....	Feb. 20, 1915.
Do.....		Submarine.....	Semantha.....	Feb. 3, 1915.
Do.....		Mine.....	Regin.....	Feb. 23, 1915.
Do.....		Submarine.....	Belridge.....	Do.
Do.....		do.....	Nor.....	Apr. 1, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Eva.....	Apr. 22, 1915.
Do.....		Mine.....	Caprivi.....	Apr. 24, 1915.
Do.....		Submarine.....	Lalla.....	Apr. 30, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	America.....	May 1, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Baldwin.....	Do.
Do.....		do.....	Oscar Fr'stad.....	May 3, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Oscar, Arendal.....	Do.
Do.....		do.....	Martha.....	May 15, 1915.
Do.....		Mine.....	Maricopa.....	May 19, 1915.
Do.....		Submarine.....	Minerva.....	May 22, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Gubona.....	June 2, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Superba.....	Do.
Do.....		do.....	Glitterind.....	June 7, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Trudvang.....	Do.
Do.....		do.....	Belleglade.....	June 13, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Devanger.....	June 14, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Granit.....	June 16, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Gerda.....	1915.
Do.....		do.....	Truma.....	June 23, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Thistlebank.....	June 30, 1915.
Do.....	1,925	do.....	Cumbuskenneth.....	Do.
Do.....	1,094	do.....	Gjeso.....	Do.
Do.....		do.....	Katka.....	Do.
Do.....	914	do.....	Marna.....	Do.
Do.....	1,448	do.....	Fiery Cross.....	July 5, 1915.
Do.....		Mine.....	Peik.....	Do.
Do.....		Submarine.....	Lysaker.....	July 8, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Svein Jarl.....	July 9, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Nordaas.....	July 10, 1915.
Do.....	1,073	do.....	Harboe.....	July 15, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Rym.....	Do.
Do.....		do.....	Nordlyset.....	July 22, 1915.
Do.....	3,819	do.....	Fimreite.....	July 26, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Sogndalen.....	July 27, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	G. F. Harbitz.....	Do.
Do.....	2,730	do.....	Trondhjemsfjord.....	July 30, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Vandis.....	Aug. 5, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Horman.....	Aug. 7, 1915.
Do.....	1,081	do.....	Geiranger.....	Aug. 9, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Morna.....	Aug. 11, 1915.
Do.....	189	do.....	Jason.....	Aug. 10, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Aura.....	Aug. 13, 1915.
Do.....	820	do.....	Amulius.....	Aug. 14, 1915.
Do.....	649	do.....	Mineral.....	Do.
Do.....	1,381	do.....	Bras.....	Aug. 19, 1915.
Do.....	1,063	do.....	Magda.....	Do.
Do.....		do.....	Sverresborg.....	Do.
Do.....		do.....	Kong Gutform.....	Aug. 28, 1915.
Do.....	884	do.....	Glimt.....	Sept. 5, 1915.
Do.....	1,639	do.....	Storeaand.....	Sept. 7, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Norte.....	Sept. 13, 1915.
Do.....	563	do.....	Actle.....	Oct. 1, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Florida.....	Do.
Do.....	1,398	do.....	Salerno.....	Oct. 14, 1915.
Do.....	987	do.....	Selma.....	Oct. 26, 1915.
Do.....	1,091	do.....	Eidsiva.....	Nov. 1, 1915.
Do.....	5,600	do.....	Wacousta.....	Nov. 14, 1915.
Do.....	1,659	Mine.....	San Miguel.....	Nov. 17, 1915.
Do.....	2,379	do.....	Ulriken.....	Nov. 18, 1915.
Do.....	516	Submarine.....	Klar.....	Nov. 26, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Hercules.....	Dec. 1, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Nereus.....	Dec. 10, 1915.
Do.....	782	do.....	Ingstad.....	Do.
Do.....	780	do.....	Nico.....	Dec. 19, 1915.
Do.....	712	do.....	Homelen.....	Dec. 29, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Rigl.....	Dec. 30, 1915.
Do.....	1,912	Mine.....	Fridtjof Nansen.....	Jan. 6, 1916.
Do.....	2,275	Submarine.....	Bonheur.....	Jan. 7, 1916.
Do.....	1,158	do.....	St. Paul.....	Aug. 1, '14-Feb., '15.
Swedish.....	2,534	Mine.....	Allico.....	Do.
Do.....	1,461	do.....	Atle.....	Do.
Do.....	1,183	do.....	Andreas.....	Do.
Do.....	1,412	do.....	Droit.....	Aug. 1, '14-Feb., '15.
Do.....		Submarine.....	Heima.....	Mar. 13, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Ellida.....	May 1, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Elisa.....	May 2, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	M. Roosvall.....	May 28, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Bergladden.....	June 22, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Minosa.....	Do.
Do.....		do.....	Fram.....	June, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Otis.....	June 22, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Kipple.....	June 2, 1915.
Do.....		Mine.....	Daisy.....	July 14, 1915.
Do.....		Submarine.....	Capella.....	July 22, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Emma.....	July 28, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Sogndalen.....	July 27, 1915.

Data concerning the sinking of neutral vessels belonging to the northern neutral nations, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, etc.—Continued.

Nationality.	Tonnage.	Sunk by—	Name.	Date of sinking.
Swedish.....	303	Submarine.....	Fortuna.....	July 29, 1915.
Do.....	3,779	do.....	Malmland.....	Aug. 7, 1915.
Do.....	804	do.....	Mal.....	Aug. 9, 1915.
Do.....	1,107	do.....	Disa.....	Aug. 25, 1915.
Do.....	1,601	do.....	Sven Renstrum.....	Sept. 5, 1915.
Do.....	1,013	do.....	Frosvik.....	Sept. 22, 1915.
Do.....	1,229	do.....	Texelstroom.....	Oct. 7, 1915.
Do.....	272	do.....	Wolf.....	Nov. 1, 1915.
Danish.....	1,270	do.....	Nereus.....	Nov. 28, 1915.
Do.....	580	do.....	Skuli Fogeti.....	Aug. 1, 1914-Feb., 1915.
Do.....	2,336	Submarine.....	Hamma.....	Do.
Do.....	927	do.....	Mary.....	Do.
Do.....	2,804	do.....	Cathay.....	May 5, 1915.
Do.....	9,000	do.....	Betty.....	May 26, 1915.
Do.....	4,815	do.....	Soborg.....	May 31, 1915.
Do.....	2,229	do.....	Nogill.....	July 27, 1915.
Do.....	2,609	do.....	Maria.....	July 28, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Neptunis.....	Do.
Do.....		do.....	Lena.....	Do.
Do.....		do.....	Hans Emil.....	Aug. 7, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Frøde.....	Sept. 5, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Thorvaldsen.....	Sept. 22, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Veset.....	Sept. 25, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Minsk.....	Dec. 10, 1915.
Dutch.....	2,336	Mine.....	Houtdijk.....	Aug. 1, 1914-Feb., 1915.
Do.....	927	do.....	Nieuwand.....	Do.
Do.....	2,804	Submarine.....	Maria.....	Do.
Do.....		do.....	Media.....	Mar. 13, 1915.
Do.....		Mine.....	Schelland.....	Apr. 1, 1915.
Do.....		Warship.....	Katwyk.....	Apr. 14, 1915.
Do.....		Mine.....	Emma.....	Sept. 22, 1915.
Do.....		Submarine.....	Emdyke.....	Sept. 25, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Ellewoutsdijk.....	Dec. 7, 1915.
Do.....		Mine.....	Erin.....	Dec. 29, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Mooshaven.....	Jan. 14, 1916.
Total tonnage of Norwegian ships.....	44,030			
Total tonnage of Swedish ships.....	16,839			
Total tonnage of Dutch ships.....	25,720			
Total tonnage of Danish ships.....	4,650			
Total available tonnage of ships destroyed.....	91,239			
Total number of ships sunk by submarines.....	103			
Total number of ships sunk by mines.....	30			
Total number of ships sunk by warships.....	1			
Total number destroyed.....	134			
Total number of Norwegian ships.....	81			
Total number of Swedish ships.....	27			
Total number of Danish ships.....	15			
Total number of Dutch ships.....	11			
Total number of ships sunk.....	134			

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], with his usual good, hard, sound common sense, has said several things well worthy of remembrance, and especially this one thing, that there never was a war in the world between two or more great powers possessing land or sea strength when the rights of neutrals were strictly respected.

Mr. President, we carried on a war with France for quite a while once, when neither the French Republic nor the American Republic ever declared war, but the forces of the two countries were fighting one another upon the high seas, because the French Republic, under the control of the Convention, had defied every international law known up to that date.

Not long after that Great Britain, joining in with Prussia and with Austria, the continental powers, in making war upon the French Republic, violated nearly every right of neutrality the world had ever recognized by international law.

Mr. President, in all these troubles—this one and the previous trouble—there has been this marked distinction that goes to the heart of every man who has a heart. There was a class of hostilities and troubles that threatened and sacrificed our property. There was a class of hostilities and troubles that threatened and sacrificed our lives. Although I am not a great admirer of the ex-President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt, and never have been in a political sense, though his relations and mine personally have always been pleasant, he has said one thing that I, at least, think to be true, that any comparison between what the United States owes to her citizenship in connection with the sacrifice of life and what she owes to her citizenship in connection with the sacrifice of property is a comparison between resenting murder and resenting petty larceny. That utterance of Roosevelt is worth sinking into all your minds, and let it sink. It is true.

Mr. President, we had a war over here between the States not very many years ago as history goes, a great many years ago as the ordinary individual life goes, and what did your people do to mine? Was it your Army that whipped us? You know it

was not. If it had not been for the women and children and men whom you starved to death and the soldiers who could no longer wear a uniform and shoot, because they had nothing to eat, I imagine we might have been fighting yet. Your Navy whipped us. Your sea power strangled us. Your sea power starved our civil population first and then starved our army afterwards.

The Confederate soldier was the most quixotic human being in the world, I reckon. He was fed on Sir Walter Scott's novels and upon the ideas of chivalry that he drank from that source and from others. We sometimes made complaint, as Admiral Semmes did, that a Yankee vessel had armor on it while our vessel did not, and that it was "not a gentlemanly way of fighting." We sometimes made complaint as an old friend of mine did, that he was captured by the Yankees because he was mounted on a Yankee mule and the mule went back to the braying of the other artillery mules in the Yankee line, in the battery from which the mule had been captured. Most quixotic claims were made by all of us; but there never was a Confederate from Jeff Davis down to the humblest soldier who ever "pleaded the baby act" because his wife and children and he were starved by your Navy.

You would not even let quinine come in. You would not let quinine come for your own soldiers at Andersonville to be administered by a Federal surgeon when Jeff Davis proposed it to you.

Now, I am not complaining here. My forefathers did not complain. War is war. It is not a system of caressing. [Laughter.] War is carried on subject to certain rules of civilized warfare. We people down there for a little while thought that Sherman was a regular barbarian. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] will remember that. You people thought for a little while that Admiral Semmes was "a sea pirate," at least you said so. Are they not both angels compared with what we have seen lately in Europe? Sherman did not do anything except to burn down houses of noncombatants and issue orders at Atlanta that noncombatants must get out of Atlanta, when the poor, helpless women and children had to "trek" as best they could. But that is absolutely angelic in comparison with what has been done lately in this European war. Who ever dreamed at that time that any civilized power had any right to strew the high seas with mines, not to destroy on purpose, but to destroy accidentally, anything that incidentally struck the mine? Who ever dreamed at that time that any power at war had a right to cast bombs from midair upon noncombatant women and children sleeping peacefully in villages and cities? Who ever thought at that time that any assassin of the sea had a right, without warning, to shoot and sink men and women and children upon an unarmed merchant ship? A lot of you here have been trying to excite yourselves and trying to excite the American people lately about 19 American citizens who were killed upon Mexican soil. Killed by whom? By the Mexican Government? No. Killed by anybody pretending to represent the Mexican Government? No. Killed by bandits, killed by robbers, robbed of their clothes and of their money when they were killed so as to prove that their murderers were robbers, and yet a lot of you seem to want to shed Mexican blood and have Mexicans shed your blood because of it—oh, I beg your pardon, not your blood, but the blood of some of your fellow American citizens. None of you want to have your blood shed, not a blessed one of you. A lot of you seem to want to shed the blood of Mexicans and to have Mexicans shed your national blood, we will call it—if there is any such thing—because 19 American citizens were killed by robbers and bandits upon Mexican soil—upon Mexican soil; remember that.

There was a man by the name of Jesse James who was more or less remotely connected with the Confederate military service. Later on, his way of carrying on war not being in accordance with the Confederate Government's idea of carrying on war, his connection with the Confederate Government became rather remote, but he carried on war in his way. Suppose that in February, 1865, Jesse James had happened to kill two or three British subjects while he was killing other people, and had happened to take their watches and their money away from them while he was taking the watches and money away from other people, and suppose that the British Government had written Abraham Lincoln and Secretary of State Seward at that time a note to the effect that they would be personally liable, and that the United States Government would be held liable, unless they caught Jesse James and punished him within some period, definite or indefinite, what would you have thought? You were powerless, even with all your power, to catch or to punish him.

You put a paper blockade upon the South; nobody ever pretended that your blockade was effective all the way down the

line. The whole Atlantic coast and the whole Mexican coast was within the scope of your paper blockade, and whenever anybody violated that blockade, even if the violators got loose and escaped out upon the high seas, you captured their ships and confiscated their cargoes, and you had a right to do it. Whether you did or not the world submitted to it. My forefathers never plead the baby act about it. You whipped us in fair fight as war goes—war never is altogether fair—but you did it. Now, even-handed justice recommends the poisoned chalice to your own lips, including the doctrine of continuous voyage, which this Government either originated or very much emphasized and stretched.

Now, let me talk about cotton a little, for the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] has been talking about cotton. Cotton is worth twelve and thirty-eight one-hundredths cents a pound—middling spot cotton, not futures—in the Memphis market, which happens to be my market, and it has been worth that for two or three weeks. Prior to that time it was worth twelve and twelve and a half one hundredths cents per pound in the Memphis market for two or three months.

If peace came to-morrow, cotton would not be worth over 10 cents a pound. Why? The increased demand for explosives and tents and tarpaulins and uniforms and the increased rapidity in the destruction or wearing out of each. Whatever else this war has done, it has not lowered the price of cotton. True it is that for the first four or six months of the war the war did lower the price, because it dislocated the entire financial system, the entire exchange system, and the entire trade system. It demoralized everything in connection with imports and exports, but especially in connection with bank business, financial operations, and foreign exchange. We suffered enormously upon the first year's cotton crop after the war broke out, and I suffered my share. It has made me run pretty close to the shore for quite a long while. But at present what is becoming of the cotton crop? It is selling at from 1 to 2 cents per pound higher price than, with the same supply and demand, it would if all the world were at peace and there were no war uses for it. Why, Mr. President, Great Britain and France and Italy in normal times take 73 per cent plus of our entire cotton-export business, and that 73 per cent is going to them now. More than the usual amount is going abroad, outside of Germany, Austria, and Italy, for the neutral countries are not only getting their share, but Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Holland have been getting a little bit more, which has been pretendedly imported for themselves, but really shipped through them to Germany and her allies. So the 73 per cent amounts to-day to about 83 per cent. That is uninterfered with. Now, I want to talk plainly.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If the Senator from Mississippi will allow me to ask him a question, I will ask, does the Senator refer to our general exports or to our cotton exports?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I refer to cotton exports, of course.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator from Mississippi did not exactly understand me. I understand him now to be referring to our exports, and he did not say whether the countries he mentioned took 73 per cent of our cotton exports or whether they took 73 per cent of all our exports. I suppose he meant our cotton exports, and that was the reason I asked him the question, as I wanted to be sure that I correctly understood him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Georgia is right in his supposition, and I supposed that every Senator who understood the situation knew what I meant. Of course, our exports of cotton to Great Britain, France, and Italy could not constitute 73 per cent of our total exports of goods and merchandise, and if I failed properly to express myself—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I only want to say to the Senator from Mississippi that he is mistaken about that. If he will refer to the statistics of the department, he will find that those countries do not take 73 per cent; he will find that Germany, Austria, Norway, Holland, and Denmark take but one-third of our entire export of cotton, that Japan and other countries take about 10 per cent of it, and that the countries he names take not quite 60 per cent of it—about 55 per cent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I stand upon my assertion.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Of course the Senator can stand upon it, but he is merely mistaken.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Notwithstanding the Senator's denial, I say that, although I have not the papers by me and have not the statistics by me, Great Britain and her colonies and dependents—of course I meant to include them in the British trade—France and her dependencies, and Italy and her dependencies take about 73 per cent of our total cotton exports. Even if I were wrong about that, Holland and Norway and Sweden and Denmark have been getting during this entire war,

except during the first four or five months of financial dislocation, which affected everybody, much more than their full normal share of our cotton.

Now, I want to say another thing—that if the Senator from Georgia could have his way, and if this Congress were to pass and the President were to sign the measures which he is advocating, it would necessarily result in nonintercourse with the allies, unless the allies were going to stand still like a lot of whipped curs, while they were engaged in a war which they believe to be for life and liberty and for national independence, and obey the ukase of a United States Congress, with 90,000 men in the Army behind its ukase and only the fourth navy in the world behind it. It is absurd to suppose that they would be cowardly enough to stand bullying from a people who can not bully because they have nothing behind them to bully with, who can not bluff because they hold no hand. Men from the time they are children are bullies. A schoolboy never bullies a fellow that he knows is bigger and stronger and whom he believes braver than he is. He generally bullies somebody he thinks is weaker than he is or else who is, in his opinion, more cowardly than he is—one of the two. You stand here and say to Great Britain, to the allies, and to the balance of the world that you propose to put an embargo on the shipment of ammunition and munitions of war, contrary to our traditional theory, unless they change their paper blockade—if you choose to call it a paper blockade, but which seems to be wonderfully effective, because it stops every ship, which is more than your northern blockade did during the War between the States—you stand here and say that to them and then expect them to lie down in a fight which they believe to be a fight for the liberty and independence of the world against a newer Roman Empire, revamped and revarnished—expect them to keep quiet and purr without even growling. Will they? Of course not.

Then what will follow? Commercial nonintercourse. Then what becomes of cotton? Cut off the British market and cut off the French and the Italian market and their colonies and their dependencies, and cotton would not be worth 4 cents a pound week after next. You will not even have helped, but would have murdered the price of cotton, even after you had been base enough to make that the chief consideration of your policy.

I hate to argue a great international question from the standpoint of a special interest, even though it be my interest. I do not think it is worthy of the occasion. I do not think that the fact that I might or might not be temporarily disfinanced by this war—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will in a moment—is a sufficient reason for undertaking to let the Germans or English or French or Russians or Italians or anybody else kill American boys summoned to the colors, unprepared and undrilled and untrained, to be murdered. I do not believe it is a sufficient reason for me to justify myself for killing other country's boys even if ours were trained and drilled and ready.

Mr. President, I hope to live to see the day sometime when internationalism will become popular and when the narrow feeling, which is highly creditable as patriotism, will at least not be the leading thought of the world. I hope some day to see "a parliament of man; a federation of the world." I have not lost my hope nor have I lost my trust because of this European war. I have learned, to my sorrow and regret, that the world is less civilized by 100 years than I was foolish enough to think, but I believe still that somehow God reigns and that we are His instruments.

I thought the time had passed when noncombatants could be arraigned and put under peace bonds to keep everybody from shooting against an invading foe, and when they could not keep somebody—a foolish somebody maybe—from indulging in it they would be lined up by a belligerent as Belgian men and boys have been and shot like cattle. I did not believe that that was a possibility. It is not the first instance in my life when I have been a fool. That time I was one.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will yield to the Senator in one second.

Mr. President, the interruption of the Senator from Nebraska has for a moment taken me off the track, but I will try to conclude that thought as briefly as I can. I have come to the conclusion that the forces making for peace and liberty and honor and contract keeping and righteousness in this world have got somehow to whip the forces that are fighting for the other and opposite things; and I would hurl foul scorn at myself as my father's son if I ever came to the conclusion that I had

no right to fight for liberty and righteousness and national independence and the life of my women and children against world dominion and somebody's "place in the sun," if it became necessary to fight. I am no professional combatant, either. I have for long years submitted to hearing myself denounced as "a peace fanatic," and in a certain sense I am, for "my passion is peace," as Thomas Jefferson said, not only nationally but in every other way. I would not lift my foot against an ant upon the sidewalk if I could help it. But it is about time we were recognizing facts; and, above all things, I do not want to see Dixie, I do not want to see Georgia, Mississippi, and old Virginia, and the volunteer State of Tennessee and her sisters, Louisiana and Arkansas and the Carolinas, and all the other Southern States, put in the attitude of seeming, at any rate, to care just as much about property as they do about life; of seeming, at any rate, to care more about their particular property, which is the cotton crop, than they do about the women and children that went down unknelt and unshriven to their graves in the sea, not upon German soil, as the 19 Americans were upon Mexican soil, but upon the high seas, the property of no Government and of no power, and upon unarmed merchant vessels—"unknelt, unhonored, unsung," and unwarned. Until that question is settled I do not propose to join in any movement to nag the President of the United States and to nag this present Democratic administration—and, by the way, for a Republican administration I would say the same thing; at least I think I would, although I am not sure [laughter], because nobody is perfectly certain of himself when he is as dyed-in-the-wool partisan as I am; but I believe I would—I shall not join in any movement to nag them into something that must result in—I hardly know what it would result in, but it must result in something very bad, something worse than we can at the present time predict, at any rate.

Mr. President, I think I know my people, and when I say that, I do not mean the people of the whole United States, because I am a provincialist, an ultra southerner, and I am not in the very highest and most catholic sense even a citizen of the United States; but I do, I think, know my people, and I know that the men who followed Jackson and Lee and whose wives and children starved and who themselves starved in what they thought a holy cause—the men who followed Stonewall Jackson in his last campaign up the valley, when they had nothing to eat but parched corn and were rationed like the horses—except that the horses ate the corn raw and they ate it parched—are not ready yet to put cotton and human life upon the same level, and especially when they have sense enough to know that it would not even help cotton if they did, and that the only hope for cotton is keeping open the English, French, Italian, and neutral markets of the world. Now, I will yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi has said that he would not assert the neutral rights of the United States with the Army and Navy because they are inadequate. He has said, in effect, that he would not assert through the powers of Congress commercial pressure to compel a country to recognize our neutral rights. Now, I ask him what he would do when a country defies the protests we make against the outrages of our rights as a neutral? What would he do if he would not take either of these other courses?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if ever I said either one of those two things which the Senator from Nebraska has attributed to me, I must have said them in a dream or while I was asleep. I have forgotten them, if I ever did say them. What would I do? That question is pertinent, and I shall answer it. I should do what the United States Government did during the French revolutionary war and during the Napoleonic wars and during all the other periods of our history when we were faced with this unfortunate situation of maddened, angered, blood-intoxicated belligerents, not respecting neutral rights. I would lodge my protest, and I would uphold the principles of international law and the rights of neutrals until a proper day of reckoning came under our treaties and under general international law, rather than fight about money, if the sole cause of the quarrel were either money or base merchandise; I would wait until the people to whom I had appealed, or to whose Government I had appealed, had become sober and cool, and then I would accomplish about what the United States Government did in the case of the Geneva award. Abraham Lincoln and Seward and the men other than Seward who were advising Abraham Lincoln did not push that matter just at that time, but when the proper time came they did push it. All quarrels about money can be cured with money, and all delay in curing them with money is measured by universal agreement by a rate of interest. I would not kill one human being on the surface of this globe, American or foreign, because of mere property or because of mere dollars until I had been able at least to appeal

to a cool and self-possessed court, not maddened by war passion, not intoxicated with blood, and had then found that a foreign power had deliberately, coldly, and purposely refused to do me justice, even after an award. Then, if that took place, I would fight with what heart and strength and might and main that God had given me.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I had one other question that I wanted to present to the Senator. Of course, there is some precedent for some such method, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] suggests, such as the acts passed during the administrations of Washington and of Jefferson, the patron saint of the Senator from Mississippi, but I do not care to refer to them, although I should like to hear the Senator express his opinion of them. I want to say to the Senator, however, that there may be another issue besides money—a direct sovereign right of the United States may be invaded, as we know it has been invaded. Does the Senator know anything about the violation of the mails of the United States upon the high seas? Does he know that 63 bags of mail sent upon a Holland boat from New York to Rotterdam were seized upon the high seas, taken into the Downs, and those 63 bags of United States mail, addressed to a neutral country, were taken upon English soil—

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator means, addressed to citizens of a neutral country.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; I mean to say that the universal postal convention, enacted and reenacted for many years, in which every civilized country of the world takes part, guarantees the immunity of the mails, and contains the solemn promise that every party to it will permit the mails to cross its dominions free and immune. Finding that Great Britain insisted on censoring our mails which touch at British ports, our Post Office Department began the plan of shipping neutral mails direct to a neutral port, and then Great Britain seized those mails upon the high seas—first-class mail and registered letters, and sent by neutral citizens of one country to neutral citizens of another country—took them into a British port, and have not yet consented to render any justice. Now, I ask the Senator, suppose that right, that sovereign right, of the United States to send its mails to a neutral country is not acknowledged by Great Britain, what would the Senator do under those circumstances if he would not fight and would not pass legislation?

Mr. WILLIAMS. What the Senator wants me to say, I suppose, is that I would agree to declare war upon Great Britain and have a whole lot of Irishmen, Englishmen, Welshmen, and Scotchmen and a whole lot of Americans and Canadians and Australians killed because my mail had been interfered with. Well, I decline to do it. [Laughter in the galleries.] That is all there is about that. I do not know how important the Senator's mail is, but mine is not important enough for that; and I do not think the mail of the average citizen of the United States is, unless it is some spy within the United States bearing the title of an American citizen while he really bears allegiance to some foreign government, and, so far as he is concerned, I do not care whether his mail is interfered with or not. I pass over any reference to the single great mistake of my patron saint's—Mr. Jefferson's—life, his embargo and nonintercourse acts, which hurt us more than our enemies, and maddened New England to the verge of secession.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator permit another question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Does the Senator know what the instructions of the English Government are to its censors who examine American mail?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Nobody else does, precisely. I know what I have seen in American newspapers.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator is entirely mistaken. I have the confidential—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not care about the details.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, let me tell the Senator—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, I do not care about them.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But I should like, if the Senator will permit me—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not care what they are; I am not going to shed one drop of American or Canadian blood on account of any confounded [laughter in the galleries]—I beg pardon—on account of any foolish action of the British censors with regard to letters and parcel-post matter. So it is absolutely immaterial as to what they have said; I do not care about the itemized account. What they have done is wrong, and I refuse, notwithstanding it is wrong, to cut their throats about it. That is sufficient.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator does not care if the business mails of the United States are opened, and the bills of lading are examined, and the weights and prices are taken, and they are

all taken to a central authority in Great Britain, where they can be transferred to the British manufacturers and the British shipping agents, so that they may know the secrets of the United States business men and may steal away their trade in the midst of war? The Senator does not care for that? If they do that act under the great war power of censoring the mails for the purpose of promoting their own commerce, does not the Senator care?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, of course the Senator from Mississippi "cares" in a certain sense. Of course the Senator resents every act of a belligerent which violates neutral rights. I am not talking about not caring. If I said I did not care, my mouth overshot my intellect. But what I do mean is that I do not care enough to shed human blood about it. Now, as to whether the British censors take these private business letters and hand them over to British business concerns, do you know, I do not believe a word of that. I think Great Britain is a little bit too busy in war on land and on sea just at present, fighting to maintain her naval supremacy and her empire, to be engaged very much as a government right now in discovering or betraying "trade secrets." But, whether she is or not, it is one of the sad things that always accompanies a nearly universal war between peoples when each side thinks it is fighting for its existence and when they are not paying as much attention as they ought to to the bystander. It is just as if the Senator from Wyoming and I became inflamed, and both were armed and prepared, and began to shoot at one another on the street; if a bystander happened to run in between our shots it would be very bad for the bystander, and if my bullet happened to go plumb through his body or his bullet through mine and hit somebody else on the other side it would be bad for that person.

Now, you must recognize facts. When you get people engaged in deadly warfare, fighting, as they think, for their very lives, for their very liberty and national integrity, for their very civilization and culture, respectively, they are thinking chiefly about themselves; secondly, about the enemy; and thirdly, about neutrals. "You all" paid mighty little attention to neutrals during the war when you were whipping us, when you strangled us, and when you starved us—and you only whipped us by starving us. Your sea power is the way you whipped us, and you had a right to do it, after once war was declared, provided your right to declare it was recognized. We had gone into it. We went into it with our eyes open. We knew what we were meeting. You struck a country that never had made food enough to feed its own population during any year of its existence, and does not do it even now. You had a plain open-and-shut game before you. If you could just keep up the embargo long enough we would die by self-strangulation, by starvation; and we did.

No; I am not saying that I do not care about these violations of neutral rights. I am merely saying what I said a moment ago—that I do not care enough about them to shed blood about them.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I went further than that, Mr. President.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Here are 3,000 miles of boundary between us and Canada up here. We never have had a fort along that line. They are as much Americans as we are, although they call themselves Canadians, and we assume to ourselves the name of an entire continent. Do I want my boy to go out and kill Canadian boys, and Canadian boys to come in and kill my boy—and if we go to war some of my boys will be in it—because somebody stopped Mr. Threefoot's mail on its way to Schweisenskopt or somewhere else in Sweden, Copenhagen, Norway, or somewhere else?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] does not propose to go to war.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, no. He proposes to do what will force us into commercial nonintercourse, with the hazard of war half considered.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. And the Senator is not in favor of that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I am not.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. What is he in favor of? Again I ask him, What is he in favor of doing for the purpose of compelling the observance of our neutral rights?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have told the Senator twice.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. He is in favor of letting them go on—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. And prosecuting a damage suit in some future years.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Ah, well!

Mr. HITCHCOCK. What is he in favor of doing for the purpose of stopping them now?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska as an individual did me some money wrong, as an indi-

vidual he would not think it was cowardice or poltroonery upon my part if I said that I would leave it to the determination of some cool, nonimpassioned third party to act as a judge. Now, why should it be cowardice or poltroonery between nations?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, then, suppose the thing went on, the offense continued, indefinitely?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, well, suppose that the moon were made of green cheese. [Laughter in the galleries.] We have not arrived at that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The occupants of the galleries will please preserve order.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. We are there now, right in the midst of it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, no; we are not.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It has been going on for months.

Mr. WILLIAMS. God's honest truth is that—no; I will not say that, because there are some truths that you ought not to tell upon the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I have already said what I thought we ought to do. What I think we ought to do is that where a damage sounds in money we ought to claim money in damages, and where there is nothing at stake except money that we ought not to shed blood in order to constitute for ourselves a remedy. In other words, I illustrated it by the Geneva award. I could have illustrated it by a hundred other cases where a neutral country, when two belligerents were excited and blood intoxicated, waited for money-indemnity cure until a time came suited to it. I would not surrender one neutral right in the world. I would declare and redeclare every one of them. I would protest against every violation; but I would not shed blood about base merchandise if I could help it.

That it is my answer, and, if it is not sufficient, it is all the answer I can make. The only thing I would shed blood about is blood. When a man came to taking the blood of my wife and my children, then I would want his. The distinction seems to me to be pretty plain. It is plain to men who were raised as I was raised. I never heard, in the time of the duello in the South, about gentlemen ever challenging one another about money. I never heard that the worst duelist fanatic in the world ever wanted to kill another man about a bill or about a property damage, and I am not going to do it now.

Mr. President, 19 American citizens are killed on Mexican soil, and a whole lot of you want to nag and nag and nag your President into a course of conduct that will result in war with the Mexican people. You want to go down and kill a lot of Mexican peons and a lot of Yaquis and a lot of other Mexicans because a Jesse James bandit somewhere robbed and killed a certain number of your citizens. And yet not a blessed one of you is introducing a resolution about the several hundred Americans killed, not on German soil but upon the high seas; not by irresponsible bandits but by the prepared and declared policy of a Government. And why? Why are you pursuing such different courses? Simply because you think Mexico is little enough to be kicked, and Germany is too big to be kicked. That is all.

I am not blaming you about the course pursued with regard to Germany. I make many allowances for those people. I do not hate Germans and Germany. I love German literature; I love German history; I love German lakes and rivers and mountains and seas; I love German culture, and I love especially the people of the Rhine country and about Wurtemberg and Schwaben and Bavaria. I know they are my equals and yours. I am not quarreling with you because you are not nagging the President about Germany. I am not quarreling with you about that; but I am quarreling with you because you are nagging him about Mexico when no Mexican governmental offense has been committed, and when you dare not nag him about Germany. You are wise when you do not. You had better get ready, so that you can support your "nagging," before you get to nagging anybody who can fight back. What is more, you know it, and by divergent courses of conduct and elocution you are daily and hourly confessing it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] brought to the attention of the Senate a list of vessels that had been sunk by German torpedo boats, submarines, mines, or some other kind of device, and he stated that he desired both sides of the case presented to the Senate.

We may all congratulate ourselves that the side of the United States, so far as Germany is concerned, has been presented and that every indication justifies the hope that the position of the United States upon the subject of safety at sea has been recognized, and that great good has resulted from the course pursued by our Government. I wish, however, to call attention to the fact that in February the President of the United States submitted both to Germany and to Great Britain a request that each should agree in future to cease acts violative of estab-

lished rules of international law—Germany to abandon her submarine attacks, Great Britain to abandon her disregard of international law in the suppression of shipments of foodstuffs going to Germany. Germany's answer practically accepted the suggestion of the United States, and Great Britain's practically repudiated it.

I am no apologist for what has been done by Germany. I am proud of the fact that our Government has contributed to bring to a stop conduct upon the ocean that endangered human life. But, Mr. President, to call attention to the fact that Great Britain has not only disregarded our rights upon the ocean, but continues to do so, and refuses absolutely to recognize the sovereign rights of this country, should not in any sense be considered a condonation of what Germany has done.

Our German troubles are practically over; and the beneficial results of the communications that have passed between the two countries I trust will live in time to come.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a minute?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. I do not interrupt the Senator for the purpose of disturbing him or annoying him in his argument.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It will not disturb me at all.

Mr. NELSON. I simply want to call his attention to the fact that so far as our negotiations with the German Government related to submarines, there was only an understanding as to what they call "liners," the great steamships that carry passengers on regular routes. The agreement or understanding, or whatever you may call it, that was made between our Government and the German Government, related only to that kind of ships, and not to the freighters—not to other ships than merely the liners that carry passengers on regular routes.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think the Senator is mistaken about that. I think it extends to stopping before sinking freighters also. I so understand it.

What is the attitude of Great Britain? Each violation by Great Britain is followed by another violation of our international rights. Because Germany has been guilty of murder, are we for that reason to concede the right of perpetual robbery to Great Britain? Are we, each time we ask for recognition by the Senate and by the House of our rights upon the ocean, disregarded by Great Britain, to be turned off from their consideration by something that I trust is a thing of the past, and has been practically disposed of by diplomatic negotiations? I trust not.

But, Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], differing so much as he does at different times both in the accuracy of his intellect and in his style of expression, this afternoon presented himself in an inaccurate frame of mind. He declared that the first assertion of the right of seizure of ships or cargoes upon the theory of continuous voyage was set up by the United States during the Civil War. Why, the Senator does not manifest his usual familiarity with history. He surely should know the earlier cases in which this doctrine was set up in Great Britain, and the difference between the two lines of thought. He says that during the Civil War the United States Government blockaded the coasts of all the Southern States and of Mexico. Again he shows his utter inaccuracy, his lack of knowledge upon which to predicate a statement. The order of blockade issued by President Lincoln was limited to the Rio Grande, and if the Senator were at all familiar with the cases upon this subject he would know that in the *Peterhof* case the Supreme Court called attention to the fact that the order of blockade stopped at the Rio Grande, and that it did not apply to Matamoras, across the Rio Grande, and that innocent commerce could pass into the Confederate States through Matamoras free from any interference by the United States.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. STERLING. I should like to ask the Senator if he can tell how long prior to the Civil War England had abandoned the doctrine of continuous voyage?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The continuous-voyage rule, as laid down by Great Britain before the Civil War and as laid down by the National Government during the Civil War, has no connection whatever with the issue to-day between the United States and Great Britain. The continuous-voyage doctrine as laid down by Great Britain was with reference to her colonies, and limited to them, and it does not touch our issue at all.

Mr. STERLING. And even the doctrine of continuous voyage, as it related to the colonies of Great Britain, had been abandoned long prior to the Civil War; had it not?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think so. It had been questioned, at least, and I think there had been no continued enforcement of it.

The doctrine asserted by the United States in the *Bermuda* case was on a construction of facts; the court found that the vessel left England with the purpose, really, of going to Charleston and running the blockade, and for this reason it was subject to seizure at any time, though it nominally had a destination of Nassau, while its real destination was a southern port closed by blockade. That was the doctrine of the *Bermuda* case, and that was the doctrine applied to the goods in the *Springbok* case.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do.

Mr. WALSH. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia, so that this matter can be gotten straight, whether there has been any controversy whatever between our Government and Great Britain in this matter touching the doctrine of continuous voyage?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think not.

Mr. WALSH. Do not both of them admit the doctrine as applied to the present situation?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think each agree that the doctrine of a continuous voyage does not justify a belligerent in seizing neutral goods going to a neutral port, and from there to the enemy, if the goods are innocent.

Mr. WALSH. The United States concedes that they may justly apply the doctrine of continuous voyage?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. To contraband.

Mr. WALSH. To contraband.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Why, certainly; and Great Britain has never asserted the right under rules of international law to apply it to innocent goods, or to apply it to conditional contraband where she could not show that the conditional contraband was intended for the army or navy of the enemy. She has not proceeded under the rules of international law. She has set up a bald order in council, setting aside international law.

But the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] has assumed to speak for "my people." He is very eloquent when he talks about "my people," though not always very accurate. It always amuses me when he discusses a business question. He is entitled to preeminence for his incapacity to handle business questions, either in discussion or in reference to statistics. He tells us he is the cotton planter from Mississippi! I desire to assure the people of the country that they are not limited to his production for their supplies. [Laughter.]

But the Senator from Mississippi turned on me with a ferocious look—I almost trembled—and asserted that "my people would resist the idea of putting money above life." Then he talked about the "code duello." Well, he has lived ages ago. I do not know anything about that. Thank God, it had passed out before I came along. I deny his right to suggest, directly or indirectly, that those of us who criticize the course of Great Britain in suppressing our legal trade have placed commerce above life. It is an unfounded suggestion. It is an inexcusable one. It is the refuge of the advocate to divert attention from the real charge.

There is not a people anywhere more loyal to personal rights than the people of the section that I have the privilege in part to represent; but I do not place them in that respect ahead of our neighbors farther north or west. My own belief is that the people of our entire country, let them come from where they will, place life above property. But I have yet to find, even in my section, those who for that reason are willing to have all their property rights and the sovereign rights of this Nation disregarded. There may be some few who, like the Senator from Mississippi, soar in such lofty flights at times that they place property so low that they object to any word ever being spoken in defense of it; but I deny that that sentiment represents the people of the section from which I come. I am sure that they would not embarrass the President.

The Senator says that we are seeking to nag the President. The statement is absurd. It is from lack of information that the Senator so expresses himself. Unfortunately, he did not have the advantage of hearing the entire presentation of the subject which I made. He only came in at the last, and lacks information; and now he has left, and still insists upon not being informed.

Mr. President and Senators, I would not nag the President. I have the highest regard for him. I expect to support him this

fall for reelection, and I hope the good judgment of the people of the country will keep him where he is. I do not differ with the President about this matter. I am following the letters of the State Department, and asking Congress to do its part. I do not mean that under no circumstances would I differ with the President. If I thought a President was doing anything calculated to involve this country in war which was unnecessary, I would deem it the part of patriotism to protest his action. I do not admit that a President must be followed if his conduct would bring the country to war, when those who have the right to declare war disagree with him. Fortunately, however, no such condition confronts us. The President has resisted, under great pressure, those who would have involved us in war.

The President placed the loss of life first in his diplomatic notes; but he did not fail, as the negotiations moved along, to present a most earnest protest against the illegality of the course of Great Britain. In opening my remarks I took occasion to call attention to the splendid letter of March 30 and to show that that letter protests squarely not only what Great Britain is doing now, but the right of Great Britain, if a complete blockade should be made, to stop our trade to neutral ports.

Mr. President, that splendid country, Sweden, those brave people, are standing out for their commercial rights. I want to reach a hand across the ocean and say: "We stand by you," not in a spirit of war but in a spirit of courage and manhood; not in a spirit of bullying. I have uttered no words that sounded like bullying. The face of the Senator from Mississippi, as he turned upon me, had every appearance that I was to be bullied and silenced; but for some reason I was not frightened, even by his assumption of knowledge and superiority. What I ask is that we let it be known that we understand our rights, not to bully Great Britain, but to call on Great Britain to return to law, to return to the law which she has made, and give her great statesman the support that action on our part would furnish to stand out against lawless acts. I long to see those principles of international law that Great Britain and the United States together have given to the world fully followed by both nations; that they may mitigate the evils of war and help to strengthen the rights of those at peace.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I am not going to prolong this discussion longer than a very brief moment, but I want to submit a few observations. That England's interference with business intercourse between the neutral nations on the high seas is in violation of international law which she herself was a party to writing and which she herself had admitted to be the law from time immemorial there is no question. The people of the State whom I have the honor to represent in this Chamber have suffered grievously from that violation. It has cost the cotton growers of the South on the crop of 1915, in my judgment, not less than one quarter of a billion dollars. It has enabled the manufacturers of Great Britain, France, Italy, and Russia and the manufacturers in the United States to obtain cotton for their mills at 75 per cent of its true value, and the losses resulting from this unfortunate situation have fallen heavily upon the men, women, and children who toiled for 12 long weary months to produce the cotton. Something has been said about going to war—taking human life to promote commercial interests. Mr. President, I do not want to go to war; I would not go to war for the purpose of promoting commercial interests. I would not have the United States Government sacrifice one soldier for all the money on earth. But I maintain it is incumbent upon the United States Government to protect the business interests of its citizens. I hold it is just as much the duty of the American Government to protect her citizens against robbery, against plunder; in other words, protect them in the enjoyment of their liberty and property as it is to protect them in the enjoyment of life. Unless they shall be thus protected, life would not be worth living. If the business rights of the citizens are not protected, if international law shall be violated and our citizens robbed and plundered without interference or protest on the part of our own Government, it is but a short step from such a violation of the law to that of murder. No; we do not want war, and every means possible consistent with honor should be exhausted and every expedient available should be employed to avoid war, with all of its horrible consequences. Nobody is asking the United States to go to war with Great Britain at this time in order to protect the business interests of the people of America and force her to observe the law. But the reverse is true. We are only asking the United States Government to employ peaceful means within its power by which the Government of Great Britain may be induced to respect the business rights of the American people.

Now, to say that we will permit England to continue the methods of the highwayman, which she has persisted in for nearly a year without protest, lest she may retaliate by cutting off all business intercourse, is asking the American people to be guilty of something which to my mind approaches pusillanimity. If the Congress shall pass an act putting an embargo upon the shipments of munitions to the allies, to remain in force until the allies shall cease to interfere with trade between the neutral nations, it would be doing no more than we have a right inherently to do. We have a right to employ retaliatory or any other measures for the protection of the American people, and if war should come from the exercise of our inherent, legitimate rights the responsibility for war will not be upon the American people. I hope, Mr. President, that we have not become a nation of cravens. We will not sell our manhood for 4 cents a pound on cotton; we will not yield to the tyrant's demand, even though it should involve us in war; and I want to say further just in this connection that the American Government is amply able both on the sea and land to defend the rights of her people. We have the greatest Navy to-day the world has ever known, with the exception of Great Britain's and as large an army as may be necessary to defend the American flag and keep that sacred emblem in the air, and we are ready to-day to do service in that noble undertaking. I am very weary, if I may be permitted to use that cant expression, Mr. President, of listening to all this talk both in the Halls of Congress and in the public press about the inadequacy of our Navy and insufficiency of our Army. The contention made by the Senator from Georgia is sustained by all writers of international law. He is in this matter only following the lead of the President of the United States and of the great Secretary of State, Mr. Lansing, in his interpretation of the law. He has insisted upon what every other patriotic representative of the American people should insist upon, that even the exigencies of war can not be urged as an excuse for a gross and palpable violation of international law, especially a violation of the law which is followed by such disastrous consequences as that which flows from the conduct of the allies in interfering with the legitimate commerce of a neutral country. All we ask is justice—that the rights of our citizens shall be respected and the honor of the Nation upheld. For my country—

I am not covetous for gold,
Nor care I who doth feed upon my cost;
It yearns me not if men my garments wear;
Such outward things dwell not in my desires;
But if it be a sin to covet honor,
I am the most offending soul alive.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. KERN. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be until Monday next. I make this motion because there is a great deal of committee work to do, and I have been requested by Members on both sides to be given an opportunity to complete certain committee work.

The motion was agreed to.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE]. The amendment to the amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of the words proposed to be inserted by the Senator from Arkansas insert:

Within two years after the passage of this act the President shall invite the cooperation of the principal nations interested in the affairs of that part of the world in which the Philippines are located, for the purpose and to the end that the cooperating nations shall mutually pledge themselves, in the form of a treaty or other binding agreement, to recognize and respect the sovereignty and independence of the said Philippines, and also to mutually obligate themselves, equally and not one primarily nor to any greater extent than another, to maintain as against external force the sovereignty of said Philippines for the period of not less than five years from the taking effect of such treaty or agreement.

Within one year after the taking effect of such treaty or agreement the President is hereby authorized and directed to withdraw and surrender all right of possession, supervision, jurisdiction, control, or sovereignty now existing and exercised by the United States in and over the territory and people of the Philippines.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I submit the following amendment to Senate bill 381, the Philippine government bill, which I should like to have printed.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Let it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the proposed amendment for the information of the Senate.

The SECRETARY. After the word "appoint," on line 10, page 21, insert "all executive secretaries, directors and assistant directors, chiefs and assistant chiefs, superintendents and assistant superintendents of departments, bureaus, and divisions, the attorney general and assistant attorney general, collectors and deputy collectors of customs, and," and after the word "such," on line 11, insert the word "other," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 22. That the supreme executive power shall be vested in an executive officer, whose official title shall be "The Governor General of the Philippine Islands." He shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, and hold his office at the pleasure of the President and until his successor is chosen and qualified. The Governor General shall reside in the Philippine Islands during his official incumbency and maintain his office at the seat of government. He shall, unless otherwise herein provided, appoint all executive secretaries, directors and assistant directors, chiefs and assistant chiefs, superintendents and assistant superintendents of departments, bureaus, and divisions, the attorney general and assistant attorney general, collectors and deputy collectors of customs, and, by and with the consent of the Philippine Senate, such other officers as may now be appointed by the Governor General, or such as he is authorized by this act to appoint, or whom he may hereafter be authorized by law to appoint; but appointments made while the senate is not in session shall be effective either until disapproval or until the next adjournment of the senate, etc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, in view of the fact that there will be no session to-morrow, and there is no likelihood of disposing of the bill this afternoon, I desire to submit to the Senator in charge of the bill if it would not be proper to terminate the proceeding upon it at least formally. It is perfectly evident that the measure can not be disposed of to-day, and by running over until Monday it is likely that it can be disposed of on that day or certainly the day following.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is thoroughly satisfactory to me either to lay the bill aside temporarily or to adjourn. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the bill is temporarily laid aside.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico:

H. R. 65. An act to ratify, approve, and confirm an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii relating to certain gas, electric light and power, telephone, railroad, and street railway companies and franchises in the Territory of Hawaii, and amending the laws relating thereto;

H. R. 3042. An act to ratify, approve, and confirm sections 1, 2, and 3 of an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii relating to the board of harbor commissioners of the Territory, as herein amended, and amending the laws relating thereto; and

H. R. 6241. An act to ratify, approve, and confirm an act amending the franchise granted to H. P. Baldwin, R. A. Wadsworth, J. N. S. Williams, D. C. Lindsay, C. D. Lufkin, James L. Coke, and W. T. Robinson, and now held under assignment to Island Electric Co. (Ltd.), by extending it to include the Makawao district on the island of Maui, Territory of Hawaii; and extending the control of the public-utilities commission of the Territory of Hawaii to said franchise and its holder.

H. R. 153. An act to create a bureau of labor safety in the Department of Labor was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 407. An act to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 24, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 20, 1916.

REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Clyde A. Rosseter to be register of the land office at Valentine, Nebr.

James Y. Callahan to be register of the land office at Guthrie, Okla.

POSTMASTERS.

ARKANSAS.

Horace Palmer Cravens, Magazine.
W. L. Jarman, Helena.

KANSAS.

I. J. Hart, Pleasanton.

MICHIGAN.

John W. Barley, Dexter.
Clio S. Case, Brighton.

MINNESOTA.

Jessie J. W. Hogue, Tyler.
John Kasper, Faribault.

NEBRASKA.

Francis A. Thompson, Clay Center.

PENNSYLVANIA.

John F. Mann, Wilcox.

REJECTION.

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate January 20, 1916.

POSTMASTER.

Z. M. McCarroll to be postmaster at Walnut Ridge, Ark.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, January 20, 1916.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. William A. Leopold, D. D., of Bethany Evangelical Church, Norristown, Pa., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of nations and of people, we come to Thee with grateful hearts this morning, and thank Thee for health of body, strength of purpose. Guide us this day, we pray Thee, in all the ways of truth and righteousness. We can not trust ourselves, we can not trust the elements of the universe, but we can trust Thee, O Thou Supernal Guide. Guide us in all the affairs of life, and let Thy blessing rest upon the President of the United States and his Cabinet. Bless the Members of the Congress. Guide us all in the ways of righteousness and wisdom and true holiness. Help us to do right and fear no one but God, and serve Thee—the true and living God. Thy blessing be upon us as we go through the journey of life, and at last receive us into Thine own blessed kingdom, through Him who taught us to say, when we pray, Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name; Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven; give us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us, and lead us by Thy council in all the ways of righteousness, and in the end receive us as Thine. For Jesus' sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. LAZARO, be granted leave of absence for 10 days on account of important business.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. LAZARO, be granted 10 days' leave of absence on account of important business. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST ITALIANS.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague Mr. SIEGEL, who is absent at a committee hearing, may extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing therein two letters, one to himself and his answer thereto, in relation to alleged discrimination against citizens of Italian birth at the Military Academy at West Point.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET] asks unanimous consent that his colleague Mr. SIEGEL, who is unavoidably absent, may extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing two letters in relation to alleged discrimination against Italians at West Point. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9416) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes. Pending that motion I

wish to inquire of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] if we can agree upon dispensing with general debate?

Mr. CANNON. I can not agree to dispense with all general debate. Two members of the committee, not including myself, and I might want to submit a few remarks, have made requests for time, as well as others. I may say that I have requests for three hours and a half of time. I think perhaps I could get along with less than that, but two members of the committee desire to have, one, 45 minutes, and the other 40 minutes. I have a request from my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], for 60 minutes. I do not know whether he is fully in earnest about that.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, surely.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, in lieu of the fact that the House has been in general debate since the Christmas holidays, and that there are some matters in this bill that are of peculiarly urgent character, it seems to me that we should endeavor to have this general debate on some other bills where general debate is in order. I have one request on this side for one hour. I suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that he take two hours and this side will take one hour, and that he ask some of those who have made requests to take time on some other bills.

Mr. CANNON. I will try to get along with that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to three hours, two hours to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and one hour by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that general debate on this bill be confined to three hours, two hours to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and one hour by himself. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the urgent deficiency bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9416, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, with Mr. HARRISON in the chair.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Illinois to use some of his time. Any statement that I have to make regarding the bill can better be made under the five-minute rule, I think.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET].

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, this is the first bill reported by the Appropriations Committee, and I think it an appropriate time to discuss briefly the recommendations for appropriations which the administration has forwarded to us in the Book of Estimates. The appropriations made last year amounted to \$1,114,937,012.02, being larger than had ever been made at any session of any preceding Congress. Now the President recommends to us that we appropriate in this session \$1,285,857,808.16, a hundred and seventy-one millions more than the appropriations of last year, exclusive of deficiency and miscellaneous appropriations, which amounted then to \$14,600,000 and are likely to be larger this year, and so will make this year's appropriations nearly \$200,000,000 larger than last year's.

The greater part of this increase is for the Army and the Navy. For these increases I have no criticism. While I do not wish to take the time of the House now to discuss the endless subject of preparedness, I will very concisely state my position as to these appropriations.

I believe this country is in serious danger of an attack which would cost us more in 1 year than we could spend on our Army and Navy in 50 years. If either side wins in the present European war, it will emerge with a fighting machine such as the world has never known and before which we are helpless. Its navy could blow ours from the sea or bottle it tight in our ports. Between Penobscot Bay and the Chesapeake are numerous undefended harbors, where in a month they could land an army of veterans supplied with every appliance known to war and which our few ill-equipped troops would be powerless to resist. It could take our fortified cities in the rear, where they are unprotected, and easily master the richest part of our coun-

try and the seat of our greatest industries and levy contributions beside which the suggested appropriations for defense are infinitesimal. By a possible alliance with a power on the Pacific, our western coast might suffer the same fate.

It is often asserted that the victor in this war will be too exhausted for such an attack. But the victor will be at the summit of its military power, with seasoned troops, every kind of artillery and ammunition and aeroplanes and armored motors—in short, it will be rich in everything martial which we lack, and it will be poor in the products of peace, food, and clothing and luxuries and gold, which we have been accumulating in such boundless measure and, as they think, at their expense, and which they will deeply need and covet. Our very prosperity is making us a tempting prey.

We have not a friend in Europe, unless, perhaps, Belgium. We have donated millions of supplies to every nation on a scale of generosity never dreamed of before; but, nevertheless, all reports prove that we are everywhere disliked. For that I am not disposed to blame them harshly. Engaged in a death struggle, keyed to the highest pitch, unable to see any side but their own, judging everything by its effect on them, a true neutral seems to them an enemy and the rights of neutrals seem only outworn and impractical theories. Then they see us as an exasperating reality, reveling in the luxuries which they think we have gained out of their misery. There is no impulse of friendship to hold them back from attacking us. Is there any other impulse to restrain them? Those conditions which we have always considered as pledges of immunity are all gone. We trusted in the balance of power in Europe; but if one side triumphs now that will be upset. We trusted to international law and the moral opinion of the world and the rights of neutrals; but this war has shattered and destroyed them all. We trusted to 3,000 miles of ocean; but if either side triumphs it can overwhelm our Navy, and then the ocean is an easier and quicker highway than the land. The war has revolutionized both military and moral standards. To obtain respect and fair treatment to-day we must be strong.

I think our danger begins at the moment this war ends, if either side is a victor. I would prepare at once. I think we have delayed too long. I think Congress ought to have met last fall, and by this time the keels of additional battleships should have been laid, submarines put under construction, and the strengthening of our Army begun. We do not want simply to prepare so that we could ultimately win a war; we want to prepare so as to prevent a war, so that no nation will venture to attack us. They know vastly better than we what is adequate preparation. We can not deceive them. So I want our best expert advice, and I am more concerned to see some decisive steps taken quickly than to spend time in laying out a policy extending over years. It will be expensive; but better millions for defense now than billions for tribute later.

But while I would not grudge money for this primal necessity of adequate defense, this insurance against frightful calamity, we ought all the more in other directions to count the cost and try to save. That is where I criticize these estimates submitted by the administration. While our present outlay is daily exceeding our receipts and while enormous increases for defense are recommended, there is no suggestion of economy in our ordinary running expenses. On the contrary, every recommendation is for an increase. We are urged to swell the Agricultural appropriation bill from \$22,971,782, which it was last year, to \$24,159,089, an increase of \$1,187,307; the Diplomatic bill from \$4,061,280.01 to \$5,426,698.70, an increase of \$1,365,418.69; the District bill from \$11,859,584.45 to \$15,473,676.34, an increase of \$3,614,091.89; the Indian bill from \$9,771,902.76 to \$10,175,036.60, an increase of \$403,133.90; the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill from \$36,904,799.75 to \$39,749,377.25, an increase of \$2,844,577.50; the Post Office bill from \$313,364,667 to \$316,364,879, an increase of \$3,000,212; the rivers and harbors bill from \$30,000,000 to \$44,376,710, an increase of \$14,376,710; the sundry civil bill from \$126,922,750.79 to \$141,181,110.93, an increase of \$14,258,360.14; the permanent annual appropriations from \$121,567,207 to \$135,074,673, an increase of \$13,507,466.

That amounts in all to an increase in those bills of \$54,557,277.12. Included in that there is recommended for the Panama Canal \$7,956,420.83 more than was appropriated last year; and as each Congress must appropriate for that purpose whatever is necessary, I do not hold the administration responsible for that, and I deduct it, leaving \$46,600,856.29. That is the increase over last year for which this administration is responsible in these housekeeping bills, and this is a time of stress and the Democrats call themselves the party of economy. The

only bill in which they make a saving is the bill for pensions for the old soldiers. They cut that three and a half millions.

There is one singular incident which attracted my attention. The Secretary of the Treasury in his annual report states that "the postal revenues will probably amount to \$316,000,000, with expenditures for the Postal Service for the same period under existing laws of \$324,000,000." But the estimates for the Post Office appropriation bill were only \$316,000,000, and I wondered where that balance of \$8,000,000 was taken care of, and I finally found it tucked away in the estimates for permanent appropriations. There is no precedent for placing it there. Why was not the Post Office bill estimated at \$324,000,000 instead of \$316,000,000? Why was that \$8,000,000 hidden under permanent appropriations? I can think of no reason—or, at least none that I care to suggest—and I think it ought to be explained.

In view of this increase all along the line in the recommendations for next year's appropriations, it is interesting to recall that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], in his first formal speech after assuming his new duty as leader of the House, said:

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to show that there is not one word of truth in the charge of Democratic extravagance.

Such statements made by irresponsible stump speakers we are accustomed to, and we ignore. But made by the leader of this House, and made, I suppose, with as much deliberation and cool blood as the gentleman ever experiences, it is entitled to consideration.

What evidence did he give to support his statement? He supported it by two arguments, both of which were erroneous in fact and both faulty in logic. One argument was the the Republicans had voted for all the Democratic appropriations and so were estopped from criticizing them. That argument is erroneous in fact, because the minority did not, in fact, vote for those bills, and it is faulty in logic, because, even if they had, the party in control of Congress was responsible for its acts and could be held to that responsibility by the minority even if they had acquiesced in the action.

The argument of the gentleman of course will have no weight in the House, for every Member knows what he meant and how uncandid he was. He meant not that the Republicans actually voted for the bills, but that because there was no yea-and-nay vote on them those present were presumed, by a fiction of parliamentary law, to vote aye, when there was really no vote at all. To change that fiction into a fact and pretend that because of it Republicans voted for the bill may deceive those outside of this House who do not understand our procedure, but is not very worthy of a party leader. As the gentleman well knows, the fact that the minority does not demand a record vote on appropriation bills does not indicate that they are satisfied with the bills, does not prove that they consider them free from extravagance, and does not estop them from criticism. Indeed, the gentleman's own doctrine of estoppel would prevent his making the argument, for his party for years continually denounced our appropriation bills as extravagant, but still voted for them according to this parliamentary fiction. We, however, were not so unfair and uncandid as to charge them with inconsistency, or blame them for not protecting us against ourselves. The real reason no minority party, as a rule, forces record votes on appropriation bills is that these bills consist of hundreds and thousands of items; they have been fought out item by item in the Committee of the Whole House, where there can be no record vote; that is where the bills are really framed and the contest made; when they come to final passage in the House itself there can be no record vote on the separate items, there can only be a record vote on the bill as a whole; Members who think it extravagant know that the bill must pass in some shape or the wheels of Government will stop, and inasmuch as every appropriation bill is a compromise, and that bill has been thoroughly thrashed out in Committee of the Whole by the House and stamped with its approval, and is not subject to amendment, the minority hardly ever demands a record vote. It recognizes that it is the best compromise which the majority will allow to become a law.

I feel almost ashamed to take the time to state these facts, which are so well known to the Members of the House, but when a person occupying the honorable and responsible position of leader of the majority tries so unfairly to obscure the issue, I think it worth while to make it plain.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. KEATING. I do not like to interrupt the gentleman—

Mr. GILLETT. I am willing, if I have time enough.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman's statement gives the impression that we all acquiesce in what he is saying. He has just stated that no opportunity is given in the House to amend these

bills and to secure a record vote. The gentleman does not desire to convey the impression to the country that opportunity is not given for amendment in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. GILLETT. Oh, no. That is where they are discussing it, but there can be no record vote there.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman does not intend to convey the impression to the country that a vigilant minority, endeavoring to restrain an extravagant majority, has been in this House offering amendments in Committee of the Whole or in the Committee on Appropriations to cut down these so-called extravagant appropriations?

Mr. GILLETT. Well, I do not know how vigilant the minority has been. I know I have offered a great many amendments to cut down appropriations absolutely without any success.

Mr. KEATING. Has the gentleman offered those amendments in the committee or in the House?

Mr. GILLETT. In the committee; of course, I can not offer them in the House.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman means to say, in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. GILLETT. I mean in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. KEATING. Has the gentleman offered them in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. GILLETT. That is what I meant, in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. KEATING. And similar amendments have been offered from the Democratic side?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly; the Democratic side often offer such amendments.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. I will.

Mr. SHERLEY. How much support has the gentleman had from his side on this question?

Mr. GILLETT. I have had more from my side than I have had from the Democratic side.

Mr. SHERLEY. I think the gentleman will not seriously say that, although he now says it so glibly on the floor. The gentleman knows—

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman can ask a question, of course, he understands.

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. GILLETT. But he has no right to interpolate remarks.

Mr. SHERLEY. I have no desire to encroach, except I wondered if the gentleman is purporting now to maintain the proposition that the minority in Committee of the Whole has shown a disposition as a minority to hold down expenditures.

Mr. GILLETT. Members of the minority have done so in the Committee of the Whole, but I am not entering into that now. The gentleman, of course, understands that no matter which side is in the majority, the minority always is more inclined to expenditure than the majority, for the reason that the majority is checked on these extravagances by its sense of responsibility. It has the responsibility and has to go out to the country under that responsibility, whereas the minority has no such responsibility, and therefore there is always a tendency for the minority to be more liberal and more careless about expenditures than the majority.

Mr. HAMLIN and Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania rose.

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] rose first, and I yield to him; but I must say, Mr. Chairman, unless I can get more time, I can not yield extendedly; otherwise I shall be glad for any discussion.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I ask the gentleman a simple question?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is not the duty of the minority to stop the wheels of Government because the majority is extravagant, is it?

Mr. GILLETT. Of course not.

Mr. SHERLEY. May I ask just one question?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Has the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] who just interrupted been one of those active advocates in supporting his efforts toward economy?

Mr. GILLETT. I do not wish to go into personalities. [Laughter.]

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. GILLETT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HAMLIN. I desire to ask the gentleman a question. He does not desire to convey the impression to the country that the minority could not secure a record vote on these propositions if they desired to do so?

Mr. GILLETT. I do. It can not have them on all the propositions. It can have one record vote.

Mr. HAMLIN. On a motion to recommit?

Mr. GILLETT. One record vote.

Mr. HAMLIN. And putting themselves on record as protesting these bills if they want to do it?

Mr. GILLETT. I say that for 20 years, for all those years when your party was in the minority, you did not do it. It is not the custom, of course, to do it, for it is useless.

Mr. RAGSDALE. It is not on the whole question, but on every single amendment that is offered that the minority can get a vote?

Mr. GILLETT. No.

Mr. RAGSDALE. On any amendment that is adopted?

Mr. GILLETT. Any amendment adopted, of course; but they are never adopted. I have offered many an amendment, but never one that was adopted, that I can remember. If they are adopted, we do not care for a record vote, because they go through. If the Committee of the Whole adopts an economical amendment, when it comes to a record vote in the House the chairman of the committee against whose protest that was adopted does not call for a record vote, because he recognizes that the House was in favor of it and there is no use of having a record vote, although it was against his wishes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The gentleman each year, on almost every appropriation bill that comes up here for discussion, rises in his place to criticize the majority for increasing expenses. Is it not true, regardless of which party may be in power, that as the Government has grown in the past, under all political parties, increases have gradually been made in the expenses of the Government?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly, that is true; that is fair.

Mr. BARKLEY. And is it not true that such will be the policy in the future so long as this Government continues to grow and not remain standing?

Mr. GILLETT. If it grows and there is no increase in the scale of expenditure, of course there will be still increases in the expenditures, but nothing like the increases that have happened in the last Congress over the preceding Republican Congresses.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the gentleman state that the appropriation for increases within the last two years has been greater than the increases in former years?

Mr. GILLETT. I think so.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. GILLETT. I will.

Mr. FESS. Can the majority defend itself against the charge of extravagance on the ground that the minority did not prevent it?

Mr. GILLETT. It strikes me like being a baby act. They had a majority of 150 in the last Congress.

Now, that is one argument which the gentleman from North Carolina presented. The other argument which the gentleman submitted to show that his party was not extravagant was that "the Wilson administration and Democratic Congress appropriated for its first year \$17,258,000 less than for the last year of the Taft administration, and for the last year—this fiscal year—over \$10,000,000 less." That, he thinks, is sufficient proof of economy. I suppose the trouble is that the gentleman from North Carolina has lived in the atmosphere of the Ways and Means Committee, and when a Democrat deals with the tariff he enters a realm of fancy and imagination and unreality and loses his capacity to deal with real facts and figures. So it is not strange that the gentleman is mistaken in his figures and has entirely omitted certain pertinent comparisons, which, in the interest of abstract truth, I shall endeavor to supply.

In the first place, the gentleman is wrong in his figures. The clerks of the Appropriation Committee have made the computation and find that the true difference between 1914 and 1915 is \$10,549,045.85, and I have more confidence in their accuracy than in that of the gentleman from North Carolina. He has made a little mistake of \$7,000,000 in his subtraction.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Of course the question of extravagance is a relative one.

Mr. GILLETT. I am coming to that.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I wanted to ask the gentleman whether at this time he could state to the House the actual cash balance in the Treasury to-day which could be drawn upon to pay any current obligation of the Government?

Mr. GILLETT. I can not state exactly. I suppose it is about \$40,000,000.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is that all the available cash that would be subject to draft at any time?

Mr. GILLETT. I have not looked at it for a few days. I should think it was about that.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Now, can the gentleman state whether there are any outstanding obligations of the Government to-day that have not been paid?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Lots of them, from the Republican administration. They will not be paid for 10 years.

Mr. LONGWORTH. If they were paid, what would the balance be in the Treasury?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The country would be bankrupt if we paid all the obligations from public funds.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Of course you would.

Mr. GILLETT. Returning to my argument, if the comparison of the gentleman from North Carolina were a fair one—and it is not—still it would fall far short of establishing his case. I will judge him simply by Democratic standards. "Frightful extravagance" and "lavish waste" were the phrases used in the last two Democratic national platforms to characterize Republican appropriations. A reduction from \$813,000,000 in the last year of the Taft administration to \$802,000,000 in the first year of the Wilson administration, a reduction of a little over 1 per cent, would hardly be called a change from "frightful extravagance" to "that simplicity and economy which befits a democratic government," as demanded by their platform.

That is a reduction of \$11,000,000 in a total expense of \$800,000,000, and it would not be generally considered, it seems to me, a change from "frightful extravagance" and "lavish waste" to that strict economy which is supposed to be the prerogative of the Democratic Party. It is a reduction of a little over 1 per cent. That is hardly a change from the epithets which they used toward us to the encomiums they apply to themselves.

Mr. GORDON. Right there, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. GILLETT. I will yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. GORDON. Has the gentleman any figures available that would enable him to put in the RECORD a statement of the amount of continuing appropriations which in the last year of the Taft administration were fastened on its successor and the subsequent Congress?

Mr. GILLETT. I have not it in my head, but it is very easy to get.

Mr. GORDON. It was a very large sum, was it not?

Mr. GILLETT. Well, each Congress puts on a large sum.

Mr. GORDON. Was it not an exceptionally large sum?

Mr. GILLETT. I presume it was, because in the last year of the Taft administration this House was controlled by the Democrats. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GORDON. Of course, there was no way by which the Sixty-third Congress could evade those appropriations that were imposed on us, was there?

Mr. GILLETT. No; because, as I say, the Democratic Party controlled the House. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GORDON. Let me ask the gentleman one more question. Is it not a fact that the Senate and Mr. Taft himself added enormously to the appropriations made by the House in the Sixty-second Congress?

Mr. GILLETT. I will never undertake to claim that the Senate, no matter what party controls it, will ever be economical. [Laughter.]

Mr. GORDON. Well, the Republicans controlled the Senate. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GILLETT. It does not now.

Mr. GORDON. Did not Mr. Taft threaten to veto the sundry civil bill if they did not add a lot of public buildings to it?

Mr. GILLETT. I do not think so.

Mr. GORDON. The gentleman will not dispute it. It is a fact and was asserted on the floor of this House by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] and has not been disputed by anyone. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GILLETT. I will dispute it now. [Applause on the Republican side.]

As I say, this reduction of 1½ per cent was not a reduction of which a party can be very proud. It reminds me of the statement which a very distinguished Democrat made when he came before the Committee on Appropriations in the first year of the Wilson administration. He was Secretary of State, and he said he had made up his mind that there was one department of the Government that should show a reduction in cost over its predecessor, and the State Department's estimates were \$120 less than those of the Republican administration. [Laughter on

the Republican side.] That is about the scale of economies which the Democratic Party can suggest when they are driven to show a record.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. No; I can not yield any more. Well, yes; I will yield to my chairman. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. I just wanted to say that the bill—

Mr. GILLETT. Oh, I refuse to yield except for a question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman, my colleague, should not bandy my name around when he is—

Mr. GILLETT. I am not doing that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will put it in the Record.

Mr. GILLETT. You can put it in the Record when you please, but you can not put it in now. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. I thank the gentleman, but I please to put it in now. [Laughter.]

Mr. GILLETT. You can not.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But I will.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I demand order. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. GILLETT. But let us look further at this comparison, which the gentleman from North Carolina adduces as the only and sufficient proof of Democratic economy, and see if it is a fair one. He omits the Post Office bill for both years. The Post Office bill in 1914 was \$285,000,000 and in 1915 was \$313,000,000, \$28,000,000 larger. If you do not omit these bills, the appropriations of the first Democratic Congress were \$17,000,000 larger than its predecessor. He says Post Office bills are "always excluded." That is a novel and guileless proposition. If he had said Democrats always omitted them when it would be to their advantage, it might be true. But Democrats have not omitted them unless the omission helped. Democrats did not omit them when they ran a campaign on the issue of a billion-dollar Congress. If they had excluded them, it would have ruined their catch phrase, so they never thought of the justice of it. They did not omit them in their national platform before the last, when they stated and condemned the total of the Republican appropriations. But now, when it is to his advantage, the gentleman excludes them.

Extravagance can show itself in Post Office appropriations as well as elsewhere. Extravagance is apt to show itself in increase of salaries, and nowhere were salaries so increased in 1915 as in the Post Office bill which the gentleman excludes. If the gentleman did not omit the Post Office bills, both the 1915 and 1916 appropriations would be much larger than 1914, and the gentleman's argument would be gone.

But let us adopt his method, only let us carry it a little further, and let us omit not only the Post Office bills from both years but other appropriation bills for whose size everyone will admit Congress was not responsible. I rather wondered at first why the gentleman selected this one year, 1914, for his comparison with both the Democratic sessions. You expect a leader to be fair. But I find that the year 1914 had the enormous pension appropriations of \$195,000,000, while in 1915 the pension bill was only \$169,000,000. There was a saving of \$26,000,000, but that was due to no volition of Congress, no change of the law, no Democratic economy, but to the death of old soldiers. A pension appropriation bill differs from all others because Congress exercises no discretion except to estimate how many pensioners will be alive. The law determines what each shall receive, and unless they change the law—and that has not been done since 1913—the pension bill offers no opportunity for economy, but it simply appropriates the amounts the law calls for, and unless appropriations were made in 1914 which really belonged in 1913, the only reason 1915 should be smaller than 1914 was that it was estimated some thousands of the veterans would be dead and need no pensions. Should you get credit for that? Was that part of your scheme of economy? There was \$26,000,000 less required for pensions in 1915 than in 1914, and if you take that out in your comparison as you do the Post Office bills, because you were in no wise responsible for it, then both the first and second Democratic sessions spent over \$15,000,000 more than the last session of the Taft Congress. And yet the gentleman claims that there is not one word of truth in the charge of Democratic extravagance.

In all the other branches of expenditure, outside of this pension bill, the Sixty-third Congress was more extravagant than the Sixty-second. How, then, can the gentleman say there is no extravagance when he insists Republicans were always extravagant—particularly as the pension law which compelled this enormous appropriation in 1914 originated in and was passed by a Democratic House?

There is another of the appropriation bills which the gentleman might have considered in his search for Democratic economy. The river and harbor bill of 1914 was \$41,000,000. The river and harbor bill of 1915 was \$20,000,000—so that bill made a saving of \$21,000,000 for the first year of the Democratic administration over its predecessor. But is the Democratic Party entitled to that credit? Was that economy due to their wish and action? The Democratic President recommended a river and harbor appropriation of \$34,000,000. The Democratic House passed a bill for \$39,000,000. It went to the Senate, and the Democratic Senate committee reported it for \$43,000,000. Why did it not pass? Was it because of Democratic economy? It failed because Senator Burton, a Republican, led a filibuster against it, and by the power which the Senate rules give the individual Member that little band brought the Democratic majority to their knees and reduced the bill to \$20,000,000. And the gentleman is claiming that reduction as an evidence of Democratic economy. If the bill had become a law, even as your Democratic House passed it, which was its most diminutive form, then on your own basis of comparison the first Democratic Congress would have exceeded its predecessor by about \$8,000,000, and your claim of economy would be gone. But a Republican filibuster in the Senate made that economy for you.

And if, in making the comparison between the sessions of Congress which you have selected, in addition to the Post Office bill you omit the pension bill and the saving made in the Senate by the Republican filibuster, for which the Democratic Party certainly can claim no credit, then the appropriations of the first session of the Democratic administration exceeded those of the last session of the Taft administration by \$34,000,000. And the gentleman claims that this comparison refutes all charges of Democratic extravagance.

I admit that literally the Democratic Party is entitled to the credit of the Republican filibuster. The party in power is responsible for the acts of the Congress which it controls. If by happy accidents or the acts of the minority good legislation comes, the majority can properly claim it, just as it can be properly blamed for bad luck. The results accomplished by a Congress are the fruits by which the majority party must be judged, no matter how the majority was composed which passed each particular bill. It is most important that this sense of party responsibility should be strictly preserved. I would not diminish it or impair it. But when the gentleman, in his comparison, begins to omit appropriation bills on grounds of equity, the process can be carried further, and it can be shown just how much the Democrats really contributed to economy.

So far I have followed the line of comparison which the gentleman himself initiated. But I deny that he selected a fair basis for comparison. He argues that the method of determining whether a Democratic Congress is extravagant is to ascertain if it spent more than a Republican Congress, and then he proceeds to compare it with a Congress which was only half Republican. In disproving Democratic extravagance why should he compare the Democratic Party with itself? Why should he not compare its conduct with that of the party which they have always maintained furnished a standard of "frightful extravagance" and "profligate waste"? That would be the true comparison. In the year 1914, which the gentleman picked out for his comparison, Congress was not controlled by the Republicans. This House, which originates all the appropriation bills, was Democratic. The Senate, to be sure, was Republican; but I trust it is not unparliamentary or unfair to say that in my experience here I have learned never to look to the Senate for economy, no matter which party controls there. If there is to be economy, it must start and stop here. But if the gentleman had taken both the sessions of the Sixty-second Congress, which was half Republican, and compared them with both of the sessions of the Democratic Sixty-third Congress instead of selecting the session which made the best showing for his purpose, the result would have been very different. The appropriations of the Sixty-third Congress exceeded that of the Sixty-second by \$112,963,651.26. Excluding all post-office bills, the appropriations of the Sixty-third Congress exceeded those of the Sixty-second by \$43,040,187.26. And as the gentleman's only evidence that the Sixty-third Congress was not extravagant was that each of its sessions had spent less than one session of the Sixty-second Congress, when we find that, comparing the two sessions of the Sixty-third with the two sessions of the Sixty-second, according to his own select method of bookkeeping, the Democratic Congress appropriated \$43,000,000 more than its predecessor, his only prop falls from under him. And I ask, was it fair, in comparing both sessions of the Sixty-third Congress with the Sixty-second, to pick out only one session of the Sixty-second Congress when, if you had

taken both sessions, the result would have been so entirely different?

But even that comparison favors him unduly, for the Sixty-second Congress was half Democratic. To find out how much the Democrats have improved over the party which for 12 years they held up as the exemplar of extravagance let us compare the record of their first Congress, the Sixty-third, with the last Congress controlled by the Republicans, the Sixty-first. That is the natural and the fair comparison. The appropriations of the Sixty-first Congress were \$2,054,584,510.90, and the appropriations of the Sixty-third Congress were \$2,239,055,150.57; so the Sixty-third exceeded the Sixty-first by \$176,470,639.67. If you exclude the post-office bills, as the gentleman desires, the Sixty-third exceeds the Sixty-first by \$52,782,788.67. But if it is fair to exclude the post-office bills, it is certainly fair to exclude the amount devoted to the Panama Canal, for Congress exercised no discretion there. The Sixty-first Congress spent more on the canal than the Sixty-third by \$44,993,426.70. So excluding both the postal and the canal expenses the Sixty-third exceeded the Sixty-first by \$97,778,215.37. Either method of figuring disposes of the gentleman's argument that the Sixty-third Congress was economical compared with its Republican predecessor. If you include all the appropriations, the last Democratic Congress spent \$176,000,000 more than the last Republican Congress. If you omit the appropriations for the Postal Service and for the Panama Canal, it spent \$97,000,000 more.

I do not claim that the Sixty-third Congress was necessarily extravagant because it appropriated more than any of its predecessors. But that is the argument of the gentleman from North Carolina. He offers as conclusive proof that the Democratic Congress was not extravagant the fact that it spent less than the previous Congress, which was only half Democratic; and he is not even correct or fair or candid in that comparison. He does not dare to make the comparison with any of the Congresses when the Republicans had complete control because the results would be so disastrous for him. I do not think that the mere fact that a Congress spent more than its predecessor proves that it was extravagant. Personally I do not think that the Republican administrations were very economical.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. GILLET. Will the gentleman give me five minutes more?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. GILLET. I do not claim for the Republican administrations great economy, although they did not deserve the abuse heaped on them by the Democrats, but they certainly were economical compared with their Democratic successor. And if they made large appropriations they at least provided the money to meet them. That is where I specially condemn the present administration. The mere amount of money spent does not prove extravagance. The proportion of income to outgo must be considered. What is parsimony in a millionaire might be waste in a pauper. What was reasonable expenditure in good Republican times might be rank extravagance in lean Democratic years.

Last winter, when our outgo was steadily gaining on our income, when every month showed a growing deficiency, when there was no prospect of any change, when private individuals everywhere were cutting down expenses, the President recommended and the Congress adopted larger appropriations than had ever been passed by any previous Congress. That I call extravagance—not simply on the ground which ought to estop any Democrat from denying it, that the appropriations were vastly larger than those of any Republican Congress, but on the ground that no provision of income was made to meet their large appropriations. The outlook was stormy; there was every reason for trying to retrench and set aside reserve resources, and yet in the face of these conditions you went on spending lavishly for current expenses and frittering away the surplus which had been provided by Republican savings. And now we are reaping the natural result. Now we are facing inevitable and increased expenses. The surplus of \$150,000,000, or according to present bookkeeping of \$200,000,000, which this administration found in the Treasury would have gone far to meet them if it had not been wasted. And yet even now, when the President recommends to us enormous outlays for armed defense, he does not offer a single suggestion of economy or show that he is conscious of the fact that money can be provided by cutting off expenses as well as by increasing revenues.

The Democratic Party has so long been in the minority and been reproaching us for extravagance that I suspect it deceived

itself into believing that it really represented the spirit of economy. But the conduct of our finances the past two years ought to have destroyed that illusion. A few leaders may still make a pretense, but I do not think the intelligent voters who form public opinion in both parties can longer be deceived. They will not believe a party which continually denounces its opponent for extravagance and then when it achieves power itself increases enormously the very appropriation which it had so unsparingly condemned. The Democratic Party is either extravagant now or it was unjust and demagogical before. It can choose either horn of the dilemma. But it can no longer convince any impartial judge that its conduct conforms to the statements of its leaders or the pledges of its platform. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think it is the hope of all students of government that the time will come in all Congresses when candor will be the most predominant trait in men who speak about public affairs. Unfortunately every four years this country is subjected to a lot of speeches that are made simply with a view of the presidential election, and without that virtue of candor being especially prominent.

I do not believe that any man who has ever considered the workings of the American Congress but what has come to one conclusion, and that certainly is also the conclusion of the American people, that irrespective of the tendencies of respective parties, the method of making appropriations in the National Congress inevitably leads to extravagance [applause], and men who want to be candid instead of being political will so state.

No man who has served on the Committee on Appropriations, as has the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts and myself, but what knows that fact. They know that that committee comes to this floor repeatedly with bills by which they undertake to make a saving; but that there is pressure both before the bill is reported and after it is reported by Members on both sides of the aisle for additional expenditure of money that makes their efforts for economy of little avail.

Anyone can very easily cite expenditures under any party that show extravagance, but if they are frank they will say that, speaking by and large, there is no disposition on the part of the individual Member to help along the lines of economy, particularly if the subject matter happens to relate to his section of the country. That is the plain truth; and yet we all play politics, we all try to get advantages from the analysis and comparison of the statements of expenditures of one Congress with another, though we know that as long as we have the present system we will have increases of expenditure. Practically every congress in the world has found that in order to curb extravagance they had to take away from the individual member of the congress the right to increase estimates of appropriations as submitted by the administrative officers in control.

There is another thing touching expenditures and touching extravagance, and that is as to whether you shall consider simply totals as evidence of extravagance or whether you should consider what they were spent for and how they were spent. There comes in the life of every nation the need to do many things that must increase expenditures, and nothing is more shortsighted than to undertake to determine extravagance and economy simply by a mathematical determination of totals.

There recently has been much that has developed by new men taking hold of the departments as to the needs of the departments touching the physical property of the Government. That probably would have been true if Republicans had succeeded Democrats. I can cite instance after instance in connection with the Coast and Geodetic Survey, in connection with the Bureau of Fisheries, and other departments, where the physical property of the Government had reached the point that it required to be replaced and new put in its stead. Those things come about whenever you get a change from one set of officials long in power to another and without regard to parties. I am not saying this simply to offset any political advantage the gentleman from Massachusetts may get from his political speech, but because I am interested in having the people of America consider the real matters that underlie extravagance in government.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; briefly.

Mr. FESS. Would the gentleman's defense against the charge of extravagance stand also for the charge of his party in its platform against the extravagance of the Republican Party?

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I will answer the gentleman's question. In the first place, I am neither trying to make a defense or an attack. I am trying to state what is so rarely

done during times of political agitation, namely, the facts that everyone knows and few admit publicly. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GILLETT rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. I would like to continue a short time longer, and I will ask the gentleman from New York to yield me a little more time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SHERLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman that I am in accord and sympathize with what the gentleman has said; but I call attention to the fact that my remarks were made in answer to and in exposition of, as I thought, the lack of candor on the part of the leader of the Democratic Party and the leaders of this House.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am perfectly willing to admit that the gentleman agrees pretty largely with me except when he is making a political speech. I concede that now. In reply to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] I desire to say this: I agree thoroughly with the idea that a party in power must stand sponsor for what is done, but I also wish that, along with that responsibility, there could be means for making it a real responsibility, which do not exist at the present time. We all know that the method of appropriations does not in a practical sense, though it does in a theoretical sense, give to the majority party in power control over expenditures. That is one of the reasons I have been fighting for something of a budget system in our Government. It is one of the reasons why I believe that, irrespective of parties, you will not get any real remedy as long as you proceed in the present way.

Now, just a word touching the matter of revenues, Mr. Chairman, and I am through. The gentleman from Massachusetts seems to lay great stress on the fact that the Democratic Party fails to raise sufficient revenues to run the Government. That, I think, could be met simply by the statement that the facts do not warrant the assertion, but what underlies his remark, and what constantly underlies the remarks of men on his side of the Chamber, is that we do not hide the methods by which we tax the people as successfully as the Republicans do. [Laughter.] They seem to think that there is a virtue in taxing through a customhouse and a vice in taxing in any other way. I know it has been frequently said that the height of statesmanship lies in taxing the people without their knowing it. That is unfortunately largely true as to political success, but with respect to political morality it is the most vicious proposition that was ever presented to a free people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The truth of the business is that taxation is taxation, whether it comes from the customhouse or by levy of a direct tax; but the individual, when he pays a direct tax, having it brought home to him, complains, because all men like privileges and dislike obligations. When taxation comes, however, through the customhouse he is not conscious of it—it rarely can be traced—and you do not have the protest. One of the greatest statesmen that England ever produced said that you could tax the coat off a man's back without protest if you did it by indirect methods, and, reviewing the history of this country at several periods, I am inclined to think the statement was not an exaggeration.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I yield.

Mr. FESS. Is the gentleman willing to supersede the indirect taxation methods through the customhouse by the direct method?

Mr. SHERLEY. I am both willing to supersede or to increase them according as the circumstances may warrant. Do not say that is evasion. I mean it in this sense: I would not levy a tax at the customhouse simply to evade letting the people know they were paying a tax. I would levy taxes at the customhouse where I thought the subject taxed was a proper one to be taxed—a legitimate method of raising revenue.

What I resent is the constant assumption that there is some peculiar virtue in hiding a tax and a peculiar vice in letting it be known. That is the thing that leads to extravagance. Why is it that your average State legislature does not spend money so easily as the Congress of the United States does? Why is it that all of the States, talking State rights, and forgetting State obligations, are coming here with demands for new Federal activities? I will tell you why. It is because if those activities are undertaken by the States it means increased taxation that shows in the tax rate when the citizen goes to pay his taxes, and so they begin to ask whether the thing they are paying for is worth the

price paid; but they come up here, hide the fact that governmental activities mean governmental expenses and taxation, and expect to get away with it, and one of the very reasons why you are seeing thrown upon the Federal Government such a tremendous amount of work that ought to be done in the communities back home is because of the hiding of the fact that governmental activities cost money. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. I regret that I can not yield further.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. CARTER having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 4716. An act to authorize Dunklin County, Mo., and Clay County, Ark., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River; and H. R. 6448. An act to authorize Butler and Dunklin Counties, Mo., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] in his usually fair and candid way, rather more than fair, I think, considering the class of alleged argument that he has to meet and answer, has discussed some of the faults of this administration and Congress touching appropriations. I think that in general debate we should, as far as possible, confine the discussion, as the gentleman did, to the subject matter of the bill. Just at this time, however, there is another question than that of appropriations attracting wide public attention, relative to which there is a great deal of discussion, to wit, the Mexican situation, and, owing to the importance of that question, I beg leave of the House to discuss for a few minutes in connection with the consideration of this bill.

THE MEXICAN SITUATION.

The administration's Mexican policy has again borne logical, horrid, and humiliating fruit in the fiendish murder of nearly a score of American citizens at Santa Ysabel, and the only answer of the administration to this fresh evidence of brutish ferocity toward American citizens, and utter contempt of the American Government among the bandit forces of Mexico, is a polite note to Carranza to please apprehend and punish the offenders.

This fresh outbreak of hate and ferocity has aroused the country more perhaps than any of the long line of outrages and murders committed on our people in Mexico during this administration. But dastardly and deplorable as was the murder of these American mining men, journeying on a business mission, it had no aspect or element of horror which had not had its counterpart in the repeated outrages and murders of American men and women, in their homes in Mexico, which have occurred during the past three years.

Some of the comments and suggestions which this latest outrage have brought forth are, taking into consideration what has gone before, curious and significant. Gentlemen are now getting into the lists with severest denunciation who have heretofore held their peace during the development of the policy which produced, prolonged, and multiplied these outrages and murders.

We are now hearing caustic comment from some of those who have been the most unctuous and emphatic in thanking God for Wilson and meeting all adverse criticism of the administration's policy by denouncing all who have plead or protested against it as wicked partisans, pestiferous trouble makers, or bloodthirsty advocates of armed intervention.

Some who have alternately apologized for or defended the administration policy because it has, so they say, "kept us out of war," are now most anxious that Congress shall assume all responsibility, for the situation the administration policies have produced, and relieve the administration from all past and present blame by having Congress do what they have applauded the administration for not doing or proposing. Some have gone so far along this road as to offer the pusillanimous and humiliating suggestion that we invite other nations to join and assist us in avenging and defending our own people and restoring our shattered prestige in Mexico.

FIXING THE RESPONSIBILITY.

In the midst of these counsels of belated and strangely blended belligerency and timidity, of avoidance and apology, whatever is done, or may be necessary to do, should be done in full and complete appreciation, and recognition of, what has heretofore been done and left undone and of the proper responsibility for it.

Unless responsibility for what has occurred is clearly understood and definitely fixed, the acts of commission and omission, which have wrought so lamentable a condition of loss of prestige and respect in Mexico, which have brought our Government and flag into contempt and subjected our people to every conceivable insult, outrage, and violence, may, when these outrages are dimmed or forgotten, be used as precedents for like policies in the future. Policies of unjustifiable interference or unseemly alliance with factions of other nations, and supine indifference to, and deliberate neglect of, our duty to our own citizens or those whose protection we assume as the sponsor for the Monroe doctrine.

In the presence of these fresh manifestations of outlawry in Mexico, and of hatred toward our citizens and contempt of our power, let it be remembered that these and similar occurrences are the inevitable fruit and outcome of the policy the administration has with stiff-necked persistency pursued from the beginning, and that these outrages have had their genesis and development out of definite acts and purposes of the administration, even more than as the result of its vacillation, timidity, and seeming indifference.

The administration has not only failed to take prompt, decisive, and determined action for the protection of American life and property and the punishment of outrages; it has deliberately adopted a policy and pursued a line of action which brought upon our people the suspicion, ill will, and hatred of first one, then another, and finally all of the factions in Mexico, which, ripening into contempt, developed into outrage and murder.

DELIBERATE DESERTION.

More than this, the administration has exposed our people in Mexico to mortal danger, and by deliberate act deserted and abandoned them to insult, outrage, and danger of death in the fatuous pursuit of its indefensible policy. If anyone challenges the truth or accuracy of this charge, let him recall the occurrences at Tampico in the days immediately following our taking of Vera Cruz.

In the excitement of that time, when the wildest tales and rumors of occurrences at Vera Cruz were being circulated among the Mexicans in and about the oil fields of Tampico, several hundred American men, women, and children, leaving their homes and property, gathered at Tampico, expecting to find safety there under the guns of American warships. As the story of our taking of Vera Cruz and the killing of several hundred Mexicans spread in Tampico an angry, tumultuous mob gathered around the hotel where most of the Americans were quartered and began heaping upon them threats and insults.

At this juncture, upon peremptory orders from Washington, the American commander reluctantly withdrew his ship, which lay along the wharf with shotted guns and ready for action, and sailed out into the open roadstead, where lay six American battleships, leaving our people defenseless and at the mercy of an armed, angry, infuriated, and drunken mob.

The story of the nameless and unprintable insults heaped upon that little band of Americans, directed at American men in the presence of their wives and children, as related to me by one who bore, witnessed, and heard them, are calculated to make one's blood boil. They almost justified the impassioned declaration of that humiliated and exasperated citizen that he never could again respect his country's flag or think or speak with patience or patriotism of the Government at Washington.

SAVED BY A GERMAN CAPTAIN.

Fortunately for that harassed and beleaguered little band there lay in the harbor of Tampico the German gunboat *Dresden*, and her commander, without invitation or request of our authorities, trained his guns upon Tampico, served notice of his intent to use them if injury or further insult were attempted, and escorted our people—men, women, and children—to the wharf, where they were loaded on English and German boats and taken out of danger.

That April day strikes me as being one of the darkest in American history. That unspeakably infamous desertion was a deliberate part and parcel of the administration's policy, and was purposed and effected out of fear that the protection of our citizens might bring on a clash with the Mexicans, result in the joining of the two Mexican forces—the one defending and the other attacking Tampico—and thus interfere with the Presi-

dent's plan and purpose to crush and defeat the Huerta government.

KEYNOTE OF ADMINISTRATION'S POLICY.

In this infamous incident we have the keynote of the administration's policy in Mexico, a policy of personal antagonism and antipathy to an individual Mexican, of interference with the sovereign right of Mexico to manage its own affairs and fight out its quarrels without let or hindrance; to have or maintain such government, or lack of government, as suits its people, or is tolerated by them, so long as foreign lives and property are secured and protected.

POLICY OF PREJUDICE AND INTERFERENCE.

Out of the establishment, pursuit, and continuance of its policy of prejudice and interference, of alternating impertinence and apology, bluffs and vacillation, bolstered with a flood of contradictory declarations, discourse, and phrase making, have come the major part of the losses, insults, and outrages which our people in Mexico have suffered, and the spread and continuance of the reign of unspeakable demoralization and anarchy which has deluged that unhappy country.

The losses and wrongs suffered by Americans under a former administration during the revolution led by Madero were not only incomparably less frequent, widespread, or ferocious than those which have been suffered under the present administration, but they were of altogether different character. Those were, without exception, the class of occurrences inseparably connected with a condition of revolution and of the breaking down of civil government. They were not generally crimes against Americans as such, but the ordinary crimes of lawless and criminal bands or persons in the absence of restraining authority. The major portion of the innumerable lootings, confiscations, insults, outrages, and murder of Americans since this administration took control of affairs have, at least the most atrocious of them, been directed against Americans because they were Americans. They have been prompted and inspired out of exasperation over the attitude and acts of interference on the part of the American Government, and contempt born of the administration's acts of deliberate desertion of and abject failure to protect Americans in Mexico.

THE WAR AGAINST HUERTA.

The recognition of the government of Huerta as the de facto government in Mexico would not have been an absolute essential if a sound, sane, and sensible policy had otherwise been adopted. Such recognition in due and proper time would, however, have been in accordance with our uniform diplomatic practice for a century and in harmony with the subsequent practice of this administration in Peru and Haiti. In fact, it is the opinion of those well informed that the administration had no other thought or purpose for a considerable period of time than the ultimate official recognition of the fact that the Huerta government did control the machinery of government and the major portion of the territory of Mexico.

While, however, the Secretary of State journeyed the Chattanooga circuit busybodies and self-seekers brought to the ear of the President statements and rumors of uncomplimentary references alleged to have been made by Huerta to his intimates, or in convivial moments not so privately, relative to the President of the United States. Among these rumors was one that Huerta had expressed the opinion that he would be President of Mexico longer than Mr. Wilson would be President of the United States. Whereupon, or at least immediately thereafter, a complete change came over the spirit of the administration. The period of "watchful waiting" came to an end and the determination was entered upon not to recognize the Huerta government, but to destroy it and eliminate Huerta from all consideration as the head of the government in Mexico.

Smug and unctious phrases and elaborate dissertations on the cardinal virtues, and the blessings of constitutional government, were framed and fashioned in excuse of this indefensible interference with the sovereignty of an independent people, with their right to tolerate, their right to choose or select whom they saw fit. That interference, bolstered with the prayer of the Pharisee, cost us the respect of Mexicans who value the sovereignty and the independence of their Government; brought us the open enmity of all who favored the Huerta régime; the covert distrust and suspicion of even those who temporarily benefited by our act and attitude.

Even then, and to the day of its downfall, the Huerta government wherever it had the power, and with remarkable effectiveness in all the territory it controlled, protected our people and other foreigners. On the contrary, those whose cause the administration had thus openly espoused, the Villalistas, the Zapatistas, the Carranzistas, made but a feeble and perfunctory attempt to protect our people, and carefully avoided any danger

of testing or losing the loyalty of their outlying irregular and robber bands by any honest or earnest effort to control or prevent their lootings, outrage, and murder.

WHEN THE ADMINISTRATION INTERVENED.

Those who are belatedly aroused by the rising tide of public indignation are now clamoring to Congress for action rather than appealing to the White House. Have they overlooked the fact that the White House has the first and initial responsibility in our foreign relations? Have they forgotten that the White House can and has at one time acted vigorously relative to Mexico, culminating in the taking of Vera Cruz? That action was not, it is true, in defense of American lives and property. It was not, it is true, in response to the agonized cries of outraged and plundered Americans, or the mute appeal of American blood wantonly and criminally spilled. Every fact and circumstance surrounding that action evidences that it was taken because at that time the sole and single purpose of the administration's policy, the defeat of Huerta, might be further advanced by it.

Out of an incident, trivial in character, involving the formal placing in custody for an hour and a half of a small party of American sailors, in which no insult was offered or intended, not even a temper or uniform ruffled, came the request to Congress to be permitted to us the armed forces of the United States. Before Congress granted that permission our mighty fleet moved and our heroic men took Vera Cruz. Nineteen of them, just the number of those cruelly murdered the other day at Santa Ysabel, lost their lives that Huerta, who had protected American citizens, might be defeated. The next day our harassed and hunted countrymen, their wives and little ones, their lives placed in jeopardy by reason of the taking of Vera Cruz, were cruelly and wickedly abandoned, as I have stated, to the tender mercies of a Mexican mob. Their protection might in some degree have interfered with the President's determination to defeat Huerta.

FRIEND AND ALLY OF VILLA.

Continuing a plan of personal vengeance, ignoring past American practice in international intercourse, an embargo was laid against arms going to the government at Mexico City and its forces, while we flung wide open the gates of our northern border in aid and encouragement of the shipment of arms and ammunitions to the revolutionary forces in northern Mexico. In all probability we furnished the very guns and cartridges with which our defenseless citizens were recently foully slain at Santa Ysabel. The agents and emissaries, official and unofficial, of the administration kowtowed to, hobnobbed and fraternized with, Villa and all his chieftains. Administration journals proclaimed Villa the only true patriot and the hope of liberty in Mexico. In the meanwhile Villa, through his subordinates, looted and confiscated the property of native and foreigner alike, and through his relatives and henchmen conducted or absorbed the profits of brothels and gambling dens. Outwardly he expressed friendship for and promised to protect Americans, and, no doubt, made some slight effort in that direction; but his control over his bandit bands in outlying districts was slight, and he declined to imperil or sacrifice their loyalty by limiting their lootings or adequately punishing their crimes. He realized his security against anything more than polite half-apologetic demands for the protection of Americans, and punishment of those guilty of outrage, lay in the fact that the administration could not afford to proceed to extreme measures against its chief ally in its campaign to defeat Huerta.

DESERTED VILLA, EMBRACED CARRANZA.

The administration's purpose to eliminate Huerta having been accomplished, and the reign of terror and chaos, of rapine and murder, having widely extended, there came the inevitable break between Villa and Carranza. Then, again the administration's fatuous and fatal policy of taking sides as an active ally, of intervening on behalf of, one of the forces in Mexico. Carranza, profiting as he did by our attitude toward the Huerta government, always resented that attitude as an unwarranted and impertinent interference with Mexican affairs. While taking advantage of our intervention against Huerta, he refused at all times our patronizing advances, but unquestionably did make some attempt to protect the lives and property of foreigners in the territory he controlled.

I am not disposed to criticize the recognition of Carranza's government, irregular, revolutionary, unconstitutional, and comparatively ineffectual as it is. The rule long since adopted as our guide in such matters is to recognize—at least to enter into official relations with—such government as at the time is or most nearly approximates the de facto government of a country, providing it be in position and evidence an inclination and disposition to fulfill its international obligations. Assuming that the

Carranza government, among those exercising authority in Mexico, most nearly measured up to these requirements, and had given satisfactory assurances of its inclination and intent, the duty of recognition for the purpose of being in position to best protect our citizens rested with the administration. In the recognition of Carranza, however, the administration gave the clearest and most convincing proof of the indefensible character of its refusal to recognize the government of Huerta and of the hollow insincerity of its declarations that no government in Mexico would ever be recognized which did not have constitutional basis for its authority.

MEASURELESS INCONSISTENCY.

The Spanish mind is untrained in the diplomatic gymnastics of this administration and unable to follow the limitless and labyrinthian allocutions through which the administration demonstrates that what it detested, abhorred, and abjured last summer or last week is law and gospel to-day. [Applause on the Republican side.] They are unaccustomed to accept a phrase as a substitute for a fact, and do not move quickly to a realization that you may properly, logically, or honestly do to-day that which on yesterday you called on high heaven to witness you would never do. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Huerta—

Said they—

was, according to our laws and usages, entitled to at least claim the constitutionality of his government, though many of us deny its unquestioned constitutional character. But Carranza makes no claim, nor anyone for him, that his government is anything but revolutionary, and your President has theretofore declared that under no circumstances would any government be recognized that had not a constitutional basis.

TURNING ON VILLA.

Until we recognized Carranza Villa believed he would have a free hand, so far as we were concerned, to fight it out. He had not expected to be recognized as the head of government. He had the President's word that no one else would until some arrangement, at least nominally constitutional, could be had. But suddenly the administration, whose pet he had been, whose encouragement he had received, even after his break with Carranza, deserted him, and he found himself handicapped by the recognition of his rival. But Pancho Villa, with all his faults, appears to have some soldierly philosophy, and to have accepted with considerable self-restraint the conditions, which, in view of former assurances, he might properly have felt were thus unfairly created.

This, however, was but the beginning, for embargo on arms to Villa forces followed Carranza's recognition; our special representatives, Villa's erstwhile companions and compatriots, deserted him, and every device of restraint and embargo at our command was used against him. Even all this, while it led to violent outbreaks of protest, did not, it seems, wholly turn Villa against us and make him and his followers the open and sworn enemies of our people.

Against the handicaps and hardships we had raised against him Villa fought on against the Carranza forces, and seizing the opportunity while Carranza forces at Agua Prieta were less than his he planned a dashing campaign against them, believing there was no way that the Carranza garrison could be quickly reinforced. Stripped of the last ounce of surplus supplies or impedimenta, by forced marches over a barren country, Villa and his little force pressed on, and after incredible hardship, worn, hungry, tortured with thirst, a ragged remnant reached the outskirts of Agua Prieta; reached their goal only to find themselves confronted with several thousand fresh Carranza troops, who had been transported with their arms and accoutrements over American territory by rail, while his men had been trailing through the desert. There they lay, well fortified in the trenches of Agua Prieta behind American barbed-wire entanglements, well provisioned from American sources, to meet his famished, thirst-tortured troops.

WHEN VILLA TURNED.

Had the men thus confronting the erstwhile victorious constitutional leader been Americans the shock could not have been greater or our open hostility more apparent. And yet, against all these odds, he fought valiantly and only gave up the fight when hunger and thirst and decimation of his forces made further attack impossible. Then Villa took to the hills, and his followers, in looting, murderous bands, took up the work that culminated in the gruesome horror of Santa Ysabel.

Thus by following, not a policy of "watchful waiting," but of mischievous meddling and impertinent interference, coupled with base betrayal and calloused indifference to the welfare and safety of American citizens, has the administration lost the respect and the confidence, and earned the contempt, of first one and then another and finally all the people of Mexico. By the

same process has the administration subjected our citizens in Mexico, and all who seek our protection, to the sort of treatment likely to be meted out to the citizens of a country whose authorities have by their acts brought upon them the ill will and distrust or hatred of a whole people.

THE RUMORED A. B. C. AGREEMENT.

Now, we hear strange and incredible rumors that the administration has entered into agreement with the governments of other nations under which we are bound to take no step by overt act to avenge the outrages upon, or to protect the lives of our citizens in Mexico, whatever may happen or occur there, until we have received the assent and approval of such nations.

I find it hard to believe that the administration has been disposed, or has dared or presumed, to enter into so humiliating an arrangement or alliance, at least without consulting the coordinate treaty-making branch of our Government, but this rumor has wide currency.

The administration went the limit, and beyond its authority, when it intervened in behalf, and became the ally of, the Carranza government in allowing our territory to be used as the theater of warlike operations by transporting the military forces of Carranza hundreds of miles over our territory. Surely the administration has not so far forgotten the limitation of its independent authority as to believe or assume that it may enter into agreements with foreign nations binding the United States not to maintain its honor, defend the integrity of its soil, uphold its sovereignty, or protect its citizens except on the assent and permission of a foreign nation or nations. The administration has gone far in jeopardy of our rights and honor, but, unless I mistake the temper of the American people, they will not for a moment tolerate such a surrender of our sovereign rights as that.

AS TO ARMED INTERVENTION.

These persistent rumors that the administration has made agreements not to use force in Mexico without consulting other nations have followed the revival of the demand in certain quarters for armed intervention.

There is an old saying relative to the futility of locking the stable door after the horse is stolen. It would be even more futile to propose to apply a match to the barn under such circumstances.

Three years ago there were, I understand, upward of 50,000 Americans residing and doing business in Mexico. They had done much to enhance our prestige and increase our business in that country; they had built homes, invested large sums of American capital, and had property worth hundreds of millions of dollars. I have repeatedly said, and I have from the beginning believed, that under a policy of absolute neutrality and non-interference in Mexican affairs and of stern and definite insistence upon the protection of American lives and property, there never would have been any occurrences which would have justified or seriously suggested armed intervention. To-day the major portion of American property that was destructible or get-at-able is destroyed; only a handful of Americans remain in Mexico, and they are leaving rapidly. If we did not intervene when we could have saved hundreds of lives and vast properties, shall we intervene now? As we did not intervene when intervention would have protected our people, sustained our honor, and preserved our prestige, shall we intervene now when intervention can have little other purpose than that of vengeance and a belated effort to restore the prestige that is lost?

If after bearing so long the humiliation and the ignominy of the administration's policy Congress now desires to take another course across the border, well and good; but Congress should remember that if it does it, it is done at the end of an ignoble record of inactivity, during which it has allowed the policy of the administration to create a condition in Mexico in which, so far as we are concerned, practically all has been lost, including honor.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman, in speaking about the happy opportunity of intervening which was so unfortunately missed, is doubtless referring to the administration of President Taft?

Mr. MONDELL. I did not yield for the gentleman to misquote me or misstate my position—

Mr. BORLAND. I am endeavoring to state it correctly—

Mr. MONDELL. Because I have never believed armed intervention necessary if a proper policy were followed. I have constantly, continually, and on numerous occasions called attention to the fact that the policy the administration was pursuing would lead to armed intervention or to a condition of

affairs such as we now have in Mexico. I have frequently warned against the policy of interference and intermeddling, because I believed it would lead to the conditions that now exist.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman a few moments ago said that not having intervened—I do not know he said at the proper time, but at a time when it would have saved American life and property; that is what the gentleman said; that time was, I understood by the gentleman's reference, during the administration of President Taft, and that that was the time we should have intervened to save lives.

Mr. MONDELL. The administration of President Taft had nothing to do with a situation in Mexico such as has arisen during this administration.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MONDELL. I do not yield to the gentleman further, for my time is limited.

Mr. BORLAND. But this raises a very important question here.

Mr. MONDELL. I have gone over that and called attention to the fact there were comparatively few outrages before this administration; that they were not only few compared with those that have occurred since, but those which occurred were of a character that would ordinarily and necessarily arise in a country in insurrection, and none were directed at an American because he was American. They were the sort of crimes that come in a disordered country, and there were comparatively few of them. Nobody thought of intervening then but a few hot-heads; but under this administration, as a result of its policy, outrages have multiplied by the hundreds, and in the main have been directed against Americans as Americans, because of the exasperation of first one and then another of these Mexican factions against our policy, not of "watchful waiting"—there has never been a minute of "watchful waiting" since our forces took Vera Cruz—our policy of multiplied interference with the affairs of Mexico, our policy telling the Mexican people they should not be allowed to have the government and ruler they approved, but the government we approved. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BORLAND. Now will the gentleman allow me to recur to the question?

Mr. MONDELL. How much time, Mr. Chairman, have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has three minutes remaining.

Mr. BORLAND. I would like the gentleman to confine himself to the question I asked him. Would he have advised intervention when American life and property could have been saved, as he says, during the administration of President Taft?

Mr. MONDELL. I have never advised intervention, but I have continually attempted to awaken the country to the fact that this administration is bringing us by its deliberate acts of interference—of intervention, if you please—was bringing us to a position where ultimately we must intervene if we are to save anything in Mexico, either for ourselves or anybody else. We could have avoided all that if the administration had pursued a proper policy.

The gentleman talks of intervention. The administration has intervened repeatedly. It intervened against Huerta in favor of Villa, Zapata, and Carranza. It intervened in favor of Villa against Carranza, and finally it intervened in favor of Carranza against Villa. These interventions went all the way from private assurances and personal promises from the President's personal representative to sundry bandit chieftains through acts of open partisanship, like the shipment of or embargo on arms, to open acts of intervention, such as the attack on Vera Cruz and the transportation of Mexican troops over our territory. Every act of intervention that could and would prejudice our standing or embarrass or imperil our people was adopted; but this intervention always fell short of any act or attitude that would establish our prestige or protect our people. Our Democratic friends have sought, and quite successfully, to create the impression among our people that the only alternative to the administration's policy was armed intervention and war. That has not been the situation at any time.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. If I can get two minutes more, I will be glad to. Can the gentleman from Illinois yield me two minutes more?

Mr. CANNON. I can not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. I would ask the gentleman from Illinois for one more minute.

Mr. CANNON. I yield the gentleman one minute.

WHAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN DONE.

Mr. MONDELL. Had the administration in the beginning, after waiting a reasonable season to indicate disapproval of the methods employed to bring about and detestation of the crimes which accompanied the change of government in Mexico, recognized the government of Huerta, or, having refrained from so doing, made it clear we would take no hand in Mexican affairs and play no favorites; had we insisted upon the protection of the lives and property of Americans and other foreigners in Mexico; had we firmly and definitely and emphatically given all factions and all leaders to understand that our people, as well as all foreigners, must be protected and respected in their person and property on peril of our proceeding at once against the guilty parties; if this had been our policy, my opinion is there would have been but little destruction of foreign property and little loss of life or serious crimes against our people or other foreigners, and the probability is that long ere this peace would have been restored.

HOPING FOR A RETURN TO TRUE AMERICANISM.

A review of this sad and sorry record is neither pleasant nor inspiring. It is necessary to be done lest we forget the chain of causes that have produced these horrid and gruesome effects. We can not bring back the lives that have been cruelly sacrificed; we can not restore the property destroyed; we can not cure the devastation wrought; and a generation can not restore the confidence or reestablish the prestige we have lost. We can only hope and pray that Providence may in the future deliver us from such as would so foolishly and cruelly serve us in our foreign relations, and restore to us the leadership of those who shall preserve our honor and our standing and protect our citizens in every land and on every sea. [Applause.]

Mr. EAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, at the very outset of what it is hoped may not prove a wholly unprofitable discussion of a momentous and vital question, which has been suddenly and, I believe, unwarrantably thrust upon the American people regarding the national defenses and the need of increasing them at huge expense and practically without limit, it is my desire to call the attention of this House and the attention of the country to the fact that since 1905 the United States has spent upon the Army no less than \$1,071,515,401.68 and on the Navy the staggering total of \$1,474,686,315.49. The grand total is more than two and a third billions. Yet we are told by the advocates of increased appropriations for Army and Navy that the country to-day is "utterly defenseless" and that it could not "for a day" resist the approaches of a foreign foe.

That the people of the country have been considerably alarmed by the false stories given wide currency in support of the jingo program can not be doubted. They have been plied with misinformation. They have been deliberately and most cruelly deceived by those who design thus to stampede them into compliance with the great plans which call for heavy and ever heavier drafts upon the substance of the toilers. They have been worked upon in the name of patriotism until in many instances they appear ready to do the bidding of that interest which is already reckoning its stock-exchange profits out of the moneys Congress is expected to appropriate for increased armament.

But, Mr. Chairman, there are multiplying evidences that the propaganda of deceit and misinformation was begun too early. The plain folks out in the country have been given time to think and to inquire. They have been afforded an opportunity to examine some of the facts—not all of them, by any means, but enough of them to give them some basis for conclusions. Among the facts which they have come to realize is the salient one that we have already been spending money most lavishly on our Army and Navy—more than two and a third billions in the last 11 years, as before noted. If we are still without defenses, what has been done with the money? If we are still at the mercy of a foreign foe, is there any possible assurance that if expenditures were doubled better results would be secured? If more than two thousand millions of dollars have been devoted to the Army and Navy and yet these are hopelessly inadequate in the hour of possible need, have not those who have supplied the money out of their labor and their self-denial a right to demand that before another penny shall be tossed into this ravening maw some accounting must be made of all that has gone before?

How many people six months ago knew that our Navy is the second most powerful afloat? Our metropolitan newspapers and our magazines and our defense leagues studiously befogged the facts. They were careful to keep from view the testimony of our own naval experts within the year. And what was that testimony? It was given before a committee of this House. It was printed in the hearings of that committee. And it tells us

that our Navy ranks next to that of Great Britain and far ahead of the navies of France, Japan, Russia, Italy, and all other countries in the world. It outranks that of Germany, and to-day it may not be much inferior to that of England, for no one at this hour can tell what losses have been sustained by the British fleet. We know that these losses must have been heavy. We know that an inflexible censorship has been maintained by the Admiralty. We know that the German submarines have levied a terrible toll upon British merchantmen. Can it be that only these have paid the price? Can it be doubted that the fighting machines also have paid?

And if the British fleet has suffered, how has it been with the fleet of Germany? Has it gone scot free? Has it sustained no losses? Has it come through the terrible ordeal thus far unscathed? Who will believe that it has? Who will accept the hysterical notion that Germany is to-day stronger upon the sea than she was a year ago, when Admiral Fletcher and other naval experts told a committee of this House that our Naval Establishment was stronger than that of the Kaiser's?

I shall not undertake to deal with this subject, as I know it will be dealt with by the courageous and invincible leader of the majority on this floor. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] has left the Navy League of the United States without a leg to stand on in its attempt to rush the people of the United States into a mad rivalry with Europe in military and naval expansion. He has met every argument advanced by the league with irrefutable facts. He has exposed the duplicity of those who have sought to throw dust in the eyes of the American people. He has pilloried those who would commit the United States to the supreme folly of arming for an imaginary conflict, for a conflict which can only come on our own invitation and by our own devices. Too much honor can not be done this brave leader, this honest American legislator, this splendid citizen who has dared to stand up and challenge all the forces of privilege in the Republic and to confront them with the only weapon of which they are afraid—the weapon of truth.

I pay my humble tribute to this gallant leader, to this resourceful friend of the people, to this strong champion of genuine Americanism, to this man of the hour who stands between the toilers of the Republic and those who would saddle fresh burdens upon them. [Applause.] It is to him that the masses are turning in this crucial moment. They are learning to know him, to trust him, and to love him. He towers high above the sordid crew which is clamoring for more millions and more billions to carry Bethlehem Steel, Crucible Steel, Du Pont Powder, and all the rest of the "war brides" to new high levels on Wall Street. And I have the same confidence in him that I have in the cause which he has so splendidly adopted as his own; and as I believe that cause must ultimately triumph over the war traffickers whose propaganda has been sweeping across the continent, so I believe that the American people will stand by CLAUDE KITCHIN and vindicate the intrepid course which he has so wisely chosen.

Mr. Chairman, let no one on this floor deceive himself. The temper of the people of this country is not for war, nor is it for the things which make for war. And who can doubt that warships and standing armies do this very thing? Was it some mollycoddle, some little American, some pro-German, some coward and craven who said that "overgrown military establishments, under any form of government, are inauspicious to liberty and are to be regarded as peculiarly hostile to republican liberty"? No; it was the Father of his Country who so expressed himself long ago. And George Washington was at least as good an American and as brave a man as the tempestuous and explosive hero of San Juan Hill. He was at least as true a patriot as those officials of the Armor Trust and the munitions ring who are now engaged, through various defense organizations, in manufacturing sentiment in favor of a standing army on American soil and of a navy great enough to overawe the world. [Applause.]

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Did you ever hear of a man of real courage wanting to run a bluff on anybody?

Mr. BAILEY. I never did, sir.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Do you not believe that nations are just made up of individuals, and that a nation that had an iron down its back and had the right kind of courage would not want to overawe the people or want to bluff them?

Mr. BAILEY. Not any more than John L. Sullivan would want to overawe a little boy.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, the pretense is made by these evangelists of peace at any price—and it is your jingo who alone

is entitled to be known as a peace-at-any-price man—that the Army and the Navy are wanted purely for defensive purposes. But is not the pretense altogether too bald? Does it deceive anybody? Can any discerning eye fail to perceive what lies behind? The organ of the Navy League of the United States in an unguarded moment gave the whole case away. It stated with blunt frankness that the Army and Navy are wanted not for defense but for aggression, for commercial adventure, for the conquest of markets, for world supremacy, for empire. And ignorance is responsible for this folly of follies. Were the plutocrats who constitute the guiding forces of the Navy League of the United States and its allies less blind than they are regarding economic truth they would understand that it is not necessary to subdue men in order to gain their trade. It is necessary only to win their confidence, to invite and earn their trust, to meet their wants and supply their needs, and to offer them a fair equivalent for whatever value or advantage they may have to confer. The United States might annex the whole earth in a commercial sense were it to open all its markets to the world as freely as the markets of New York and Chicago are open to all the people of the 48 States. More than half the jealousies and suspicions which separate the peoples of the globe to-day grow out of the superstition that trade is war, and that in order to gain markets we must conquer the country in which the markets are found.

Let me turn for a moment to the consideration of another phase of the general question of military preparedness. We are told that we must have an Army of 2,000,000 men. Well, accepting this at face value for the time being, let us consider whether we can get it. Are the young men of America ready to make up this huge Army? They have not been overready to make up the Army we now have. With the utmost exertion and only with the most flamboyant and deceptive advertisements is it possible to keep the present force recruited. Nearly one-fifth of the men who enlist become deserters, and in becoming deserters have a price set upon their heads. During recent years nearly 50,000 men have deserted from the Regular Army of the United States. These men have become criminals in consequence. They have sacrificed their citizenship. They have fixed upon themselves by their desertion an ineffaceable stigma.

May we reasonably hope for a better state of affairs when we shall multiply our standing Army by 20, raising it from 100,000 men to 2,000,000? Will the causes of desertion be diminished in inverse proportion? Shall we turn out fewer criminals than are now being milled from that mint? Are we to resort to fewer and less gross deceptions in enticing the youth of the land to give up gainful employment and the life of home and family and widening interests for the purpose of wearing a uniform and carrying a gun? Or is the alternative to be that which is already being gravely urged—that of enforced military service? If we can not now recruit our Army fast enough to make up for desertions, how can it be possible to keep the ranks of a larger force filled unless we adopt the military systems of the Old World?

It can not be done. And the advocates of a huge standing army recognize the fact when they begin to couple with their demand a suggestion of compulsory military service. They are guilty of no self-deception. They know that if the army of which they dream is to be recruited it must be under compulsion. No country in all the tide of time has maintained a great standing army by other means. The youth of no land the sun ever shone upon were willing freely to give up the best years of their lives to military service, which meant nothing but hardship to themselves and perhaps enslavement for their country. Always and everywhere the ruling class have been compelled to resort to compulsion when they felt it necessary to buttress their power with a standing army. And the ruling class in this country are not blinking at the fact. They are meeting it fairly and are making no concealment of their plan to graft upon America a system which was the destruction of every free government of the past and that is the accepted instrument of every tyrant who now cumbers this old earth.

I want to ask my countrymen whether they are prepared to follow along this dangerous path. I want to ask them whether they are ready to sign the death warrant of free government in this Republic. I want to ask them whether they are themselves to rule or whether they are bent upon turning our institutions over to a class which feels even thus early the spur of necessity pricking it on to courses which the ruling classes of all history have pursued. Let no one tell himself that the proposals now before the country are final. They are only the beginning. Once fairly started on this road, there will be no stopping. Militarism never was satisfied; it never will be satisfied. It is always reaching out for more, always sighing, with an Alexander, for new worlds to conquer, always lamenting, with a Roosevelt,

that there is not war enough to go around. If we yield now to those who would commit us to a policy strange to our ideals and incompatible with our liberties, does anyone lay the flattering unction to his soul that these ideals and these liberties will survive a contact so baneful?

There is a subtle poison in this preparedness which is breaking down the fabric of our thought and eating out the very vitals of our national spirit. In what terms are we thinking to-day? Not in terms of peace, not in terms of brotherhood, not in terms of international amity, not in terms of good will and justice, not in terms of charity and forbearance, not in terms of patience and generous allowance. Nay. It is in quite other terms—in terms of force, in terms of suspicion, in terms of jealousy, in terms of rancor and prejudice and ill will, in terms that make for misunderstandings and bitterness, in terms rankling with the acrid venom of hatred and shot through with the deadly distillations of unreasoning passion. This may sound like empty rhetoric. But is it? Read the daily press. Listen to the fulminations from pulpit and platform where jingoism finds voice. Dip into the literature of the hour. Mingle with those who catch their inspiration from the patriots for profit. If you do not in all these find proof of what is here said, then you are capable of making interpretations which are clearly denied to me.

Mr. Chairman, of whom are we afraid? Who is offering us any affront? Who is coveting our territory? Who is threatening our institutions? I do not forget, nor have you forgotten, that the President of the United States himself has declared that we are in danger from no quarter. Yet we are asked to prepare and very adequately prepare. For what? Against whom? On what account? Who has answered or even attempted to answer these very pertinent questions? Who indeed. There is no answer to them. To attempt to answer them is to render absurd all the hysterical talk with which the country has been deluged during recent months. We are to be attacked and overwhelmed by some unnamed power when the European war is brought to an end. That is one of the answers. But every power in Europe will be exhausted when the war is over. All Europe even now is on the verge of exhaustion. Both in men and in resources the nations now at death grips are nearing the point of collapse. Yet we are asked to believe that when this tremendous struggle is brought to a close through exhaustion—and it will scarcely close short of that—one of the nations, or perhaps a combination of them, will turn at once upon us to recoup the losses that war has entailed. Could absurdity go further? Could rational minds be more grossly insulted than they are when talk of this sort is addressed to them in support of a policy otherwise without support? For there is no support for the policy except this irrational and fantastic conjuring with the possible.

Of course it is possible for Germany and Russia to combine against us when this war is over. Equally, of course, it is possible for Britain and Austria to do so. It were even possible for all the nations now at war to forget their hatreds and their jealousies and their mutual scars and to make common cause against the United States. But we are not dealing with possibilities in this world of cause and effect. We are dealing, rather, with probabilities, with reasonable sequences and consequences, with logic rather than with dreams, with facts rather than with unbridled fancies. While it may be granted that there are many possible contingencies growing out of or merely following the great war, where is the human probability that any exhausted nation or any conceivable combination of exhausted nations will thirst for more blood and seek to slake that thirst at an American fountain?

Some of us in this crisis of the Republic find ourselves most unhappily out of touch with leaders we have hitherto followed unfalteringly and with glad steps. It is a grief to us that a difference of opinion has resulted in a momentary divergence of our paths. But here I am reminded of something written by Thomas Jefferson a long time ago. It seems to fit a situation which faces us to-day as it fitted the situation which he had in mind.

During the throes and convulsions of the ancient world—

He wrote—

during the agonizing spasms of infuriated man, seeking through blood and slaughter his long-lost liberty, it was not wonderful that the agitation of the billows should reach even this distant shore; that this should be more felt and feared by some and less by others; and should divide opinion as to measures of safety. But every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle. We have called by different names brethren of the same principle. Error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left to combat it.

And it is to reason that we who stand for peace are appealing to-day. We are not questioning the patriotism of most of those who differ with us in this hour of stress. We believe

them, or most of them, actuated by motives as high and as unselfish as our own; but we honestly and most sincerely question the wisdom of the method they have chosen in dealing with a great and momentous occasion. The United States has been mightily stirred by the awful conflict raging across the Atlantic. Nearly all of us have kin over there. No home is bereft there without a shadow falling across the threshold of a home in this haven of the oppressed.

The agitation of the billows of the Baltic and the North Sea has reached even this distant and peaceful shore and many emotions in American breasts have been the response—emotions of fear, emotions of sympathy, emotions of hatred, emotions of suspicion, emotions of sheer selfishness and greed. And out of these emotions have come many and varied differences of opinion. Some of us have been concerned with respect to our own safety. These have feared that out of the blood and fury of the mighty conflict in which Europe is weltering may come a fearful danger to our own land and our own institutions. And this fear has been played upon magically by some who nurse ambitions and by others who harbor sordid desires, and by still others who cherish race prejudices or national bigotries—all together conspiring, perhaps unconsciously, to bring about a state of the public mind which tends to find expression in terms of force, in battleships and air craft, in submarines and long-range guns, in shrapnel and men in khaki.

But, happily, reason is left to combat errors of opinion which may have obtained in connection with the great conflagration which has touched us with its searing tongues. We are not bound to accept the word of authority. Each of us is free to exercise his own judgment, to follow his own conscience, to consult his own convictions. Are we in danger? If so, there is no American unready to meet it, none who would pause to count the cost involved in meeting it. We have been told, and repeatedly told, that we are not threatened from without. But are we threatened from within? If so, will continentals and warships avert the danger? May they not indeed enhance it? Revolutions are not stopped by armed men. But a thousand revolutions might have been averted by turning swords into plowshares and soldiers into husbandmen. If we are endangered from within, the situation is to be met, not by building battle fleets and planting our harbors with mines; it is not to be averted by turning the Republic into a military camp; it is not to be disposed of by levying fresh taxes on the toilers of the land; it is to be dealt with successfully only by removing the causes which produce unrest and uprooting the injustices which provoke resentment and incite bitterness of class feeling.

May I not, in conclusion, appeal to reason and to common sense in the consideration of this vital issue? The poison of preparedness has undeniably crept subtly through our whole system of thought and national effort. It has brought a sort of madness upon many minds. It has obsessed thousands with the dread of some awful consequence to ourselves of the European struggle. Yet what I contend, to paraphrase the language of the great Richard Cobden, is that America is to-day so situated in every particular of her domestic and foreign circumstances that by leaving other governments to settle their own business and fight out their own quarrels and by attending to the vast and difficult affairs of her own enormous realm and the condition of her own people she will not only be setting the world an example of noble morality—which no other nation is so happily free to set—but she will be following the very course which the maintenance of her own greatness most imperatively demands. It is precisely because America is so strong in resources, in courage, in institutions, in geographical position, that she can, before all other powers, afford to be moral and to set the example of a mighty Nation walking the paths of justice and of peace. [Applause.]

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BAILEY. If I have the time.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I notice that the gentleman says in his remarks that this Nation should deal with probabilities and not possibilities. Why should not this Nation deal with possibilities?

Mr. BAILEY. Well, it is a pretty big job.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. But we are a pretty big Nation.

Mr. BAILEY. It is quite possible we may have an eruption here almost anywhere, maybe in Washington, like they had in the island of Martinique, but we can not guard against that.

Mr. Chairman, under the leave given me to extend my remarks it is my desire to append a table setting forth the annual

appropriations on account of the Army and Navy from 1905 to 1916, inclusive. This table follows:

Expenditures on Army and Navy, 1905-1916.

	Army.	Navy.
1905	\$77,070,300.88	\$97,505,140.94
1906	70,396,631.64	100,336,679.94
1907	71,817,165.08	102,071,670.27
1908	78,634,582.75	98,958,507.50
1909	95,382,247.61	122,662,485.47
1910	101,195,883.34	136,935,199.05
1911	95,440,567.55	131,410,568.30
1912	93,374,753.97	126,405,539.24
1913	90,938,712.98	123,151,538.76
1914	94,268,145.51	140,718,434.53
1915	101,019,212.50	144,868,716.61
Total	969,556,205.11	1,325,024,450.61
1916	101,959,195.87	149,661,864.88
Total	1,071,515,401.63	1,474,686,315.49

It is also my desire to incorporate with my remarks a few extracts from a statement issued by Majority Leader KITCHIN to the press of North Carolina, respecting the strength of the Navy of the United States in comparison with the naval strength of other countries. In this statement the majority leader said:

MR. KITCHIN'S STATEMENT.

The five-year program increases our naval appropriation over forty times more than the increase by Germany in five years preceding the European war, and \$200,000,000 more than the combined increase of all the nations in the world for the five years preceding the European war, and over \$50,000,000 more than the combined increase of all the nations in the world for the whole period of 10 years immediately preceding the European war.

Add to this the fact that prior to the beginning of the European war we were expending annually on our Navy from \$20,000,000 to \$30,000,000 more than Germany or any other nation (except Great Britain) was expending on its Navy.

For the 10 years preceding the European war we had expended on our Navy over \$300,000,000 more than Germany or any other nation (except Great Britain) had expended on its Navy. And yet the metropolitan press, the magazine writers, the "patriotic societies," and the fingeres and war traffickers would frighten the country into the belief that we have a little, puny, eggshell of a Navy.

The five-year naval program calls for an increase of \$500,000,000—\$100,000,000 increase a year—which, including the inevitable incidental expenses for expanding the whole Naval Establishment in order to accommodate the program, will reach \$600,000,000 or over by the time the five years expires. This is all extra—in addition to the large appropriations we have been annually making.

The Army four-year program demands \$450,000,000 increase, over \$100,000,000 a year extra, being an increase of more than 100 per cent over our annual Army appropriations. All extra appropriation, be it remembered. Extra taxes must be paid by the people, be it remembered.

Before leaving the subject of the enormity of the proposed program, I desire to make a further observation:

At the expiration of the five-year period for the program this country will then be expending on its Navy and Army more than any nation in the world in times of peace ever expended on its army and navy; more than England, with her navalism; more than Russia or Germany, with their huge militarism. At the beginning of the European war Germany was expending for past wars and preparations for wars (on its Army and Navy) 55 per cent of the total amount of revenues collected; Japan, 45 per cent; Great Britain, 37 per cent; France, 35 per cent; the United States, over 60 per cent. With the proposed military and naval program enacted into law the United States will be expending over 70 per cent of its total revenues; that is, out of every \$100 collected from the people over \$70 will go into militarism and navalism, including pensions, leaving less than \$30 for all other functions of our Government and for all other benefits of the people.

Equally interesting are some facts relating to the personnel of the Navy League of the United States and kindred organizations, which are so largely responsible for the remarkable agitation in support of increased appropriations by Congress for the Army and Navy. Under this head I take the liberty of quoting from a recent speech on this floor by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TAVENNER]. That gentleman has made an exhaustive study of the activities of the organizations in question, and in the following has embodied some facts which the people ought to know. He said:

CONNECTING LINKS BETWEEN THE NAVY LEAGUE AND THE HOUSE OF J. P. MORGAN & CO., 23 WALL STREET, NEW YORK.

The Navy League upon close examination would appear to be little more than a branch office of the house of J. P. Morgan & Co. and a general sales promotion bureau for the various armor and munition makers and the steel, nickel, copper, and zinc interests. At least, they are all represented among the directors, officers, founders, or life members of or contributors to the Navy League.

Especially are all forms of big business represented, and big business invariably heads in at 23 Wall Street, New York.

J. P. Morgan was formerly treasurer of the Navy League and is now a director and contributor. He is a director also of the United States Steel Corporation and many other corporations.

Herbert L. Satterlee, former Assistant Secretary of the Navy Department and a brother-in-law of J. P. Morgan, was one of the incorporators and founders of the Navy League and is the present general counsel of the league.

The late J. P. Morgan was one of the founders and principal contributors to the Navy League, and as late as June 10, 1915, \$2,000 was subscribed on behalf of the Morgan estate.

Edward T. Stotesbury, a member of the firm of J. P. Morgan & Co. and a director of the Baldwin Locomotive Works, and until recently a director of Cambria Steel Co., Phoenix Iron Co., Riverside Metal Co., Temple Iron Co., Wm. Cramp & Sons Ship & Engine Building Co., and 54 other corporations, banks, and trust companies, is one of the honorary vice presidents of the Navy League. The Wall Street Journal on July 26, 1915, reported that the Baldwin Locomotive Works had received a war order for \$80,000,000 worth of shells and other munitions.

Robert Bacon, former Secretary of State and partner of J. P. Morgan & Co. and first director of the United States Steel Corporation, is a director of the Navy League.

Henry C. Frick, a fellow director of J. P. Morgan on both the United States Steel Corporation and the National City Bank of New York, is an honorary vice president of the Navy League.

Jacob H. Schiff, a director with J. P. Morgan on the National City Bank of New York, contributed \$1,000 to the Navy League June 10, 1915.

J. Ogden Armour, a director with J. P. Morgan on the National City Bank of New York, was one of a committee which, under the auspices of the National Security League, issued a statement certifying as to the patriotism of the Navy League.

Cleveland H. Dodge, a director with J. P. Morgan on the National City Bank of New York and a director of the American Brass Co., Commercial Mining Co., Copper Queen Consolidated Mining Co., Detroit Copper Mining Co., of Arizona, Lackawanna Iron & Coal Co., Montezuma Copper Co., and the United Globe Mines, is a life member of the Navy League. Marcellus H. Dodge, a nephew of Cleveland H. Dodge, is a director on the boards of the Remington Arms-Union Metallic Cartridge Co., and the Remington Arms & Ammunition Co. Cleveland H. Dodge is vice president of Phelps, Dodge & Co. (Ltd.), a \$45,000,000 corporation, which is one of the leading factors in the copper industry in the United States. Although the millions of Cleveland H. Dodge have been multiplied through the increased value of his copper holdings as a result of the European war, his firms appear unwilling to share their prosperity with the miners in Arizona. Some 5,000 copper miners are now on strike, and because Gov. Hunt, of Arizona, has dared to protect them against an invasion of lawless thugs and strike-breakers, the mine owners are circulating petitions for his recall. The leading corporation involved in the Clifton-Morenci strike is Phelps, Dodge & Co., of which Cleveland H. Dodge is vice president. The company in 1912 earned 23 per cent on its capital of \$45,000,000 and paid a 15 per cent dividend. To-day copper is higher than at any time in nine years, yet the company refuses to grant its men a wage increase or to make any concession. The principal property of the company at Clifton paid in 1912 a dividend of 146 1/2 per cent on a capital of \$1,000,000.

Joseph P. Grace, a director with J. P. Morgan on the National City Bank of New York, is one of the contributors to the funds of the Navy League.

George F. Baker, jr., a director of the First National Bank of New York and a son of a director of the United States Steel Corporation, contributed \$1,000 to the Navy League June 10, 1915.

Allan A. Ryan, a director of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, is a contributor to the Navy League, and George R. Sheldon, another director of the Bethlehem Corporation and also a director of the American Locomotive Co., both of which concerns have profited hugely from European war orders, is an honorary vice president of the Navy League. Considering that Charles M. Schwab, the president of Bethlehem, is one of the founders of the Navy League, it would appear that this war-trafficking firm has full representation in this organization. And it always has been well represented. Robert H. Sayre, a former general manager of Bethlehem, was a life member of the Navy League, and Lieut. J. F. Meigs, who left the Navy Department to go into the employ of Bethlehem, was also a life member.

Beekman Winthrop, a former Assistant Secretary of the Navy and now a director of the Lackawanna Steel Co., is a director of the Navy League.

Former United States Senator W. A. Clark, the "copper king of Montana," is a director of the Navy League and a director of the W. A. Clark Titanite Explosive Co., Colusa-Parrot Mining & Smelting Co., Equator Mining & Smelting Co., Henry-Bonnard Bronze Co., Mayflower Consolidated Mining Co., Moulton Mining Co., Ophir Hill Consolidated Mining Co., Original Consolidated Mining Co., Sunset Mining Co., United Verde Copper Co., and 26 other corporations.

Charles F. Brooker, honorary vice president of the Navy League, is president and director of the American Brass Co. and a director of the United States Smelting, Refining & Mining Co., Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., Mechanics & Metals National Bank of the city of New York, and 15 other banks, trust companies, and corporations. On April 10, 1915, Mr. Brooker also owned 474 shares of Bethlehem Steel, which was worth \$40 a share previous to the outbreak of the European war, and went as high as \$600 on October 22, 1915.

Lewis L. Clarke, treasurer of the Navy League, is a director of the American Locomotive Co. The Standard Corporation Service on May 3, 1915, reported that the American Locomotive Co. had concluded negotiations with the British Government for the manufacture of 5,000,000 shrapnel shells to cost \$66,250,000.

A. Barton Hepburn, honorary vice president of the Navy League, is a director of the American Car & Foundry Co., which has received large munitions contracts from the allies.

Henry B. Joy, vice president of the Navy League, who opposes Government manufacture of war munitions, is president of the Packard Motor Car Co., which has received large orders from the allies.

T. Coleman du Pont, president of the Du Pont de Nemours Powder Co., was formerly a vice president of the Navy League. The Du Ponts have managed to maintain a monopoly of the sale of smokeless powder to the United States Government, and have received some \$25,000,000 worth of contracts in the last 10 years.

I do not desire to make the charge that President Thompson and Secretary Dadmun, of the Navy League, are deliberately falsifying in insisting that this purely patriotic organization is backed by "men who will not profit by the league's propaganda," because it is possible that they have reiterated this view so often that they have come to actually believe it themselves. I doubt, however, whether they can convince the American people that they have not been imposed upon.

It has seemed to me worth while, Mr. Chairman, to bring the question of the cost of this program as close home as possible. No one seems to know exactly what this cost is to be. Estimates vary widely. But that it will be very large and will not

diminish as the years go by is certain. My own estimate is that the program of military and naval expansion which has been proposed will cost not less than \$500,000,000 a year. Some have set a five-year limit upon it, apparently assuming that at the end of five years we may rest from our labors in the matter of defending our shores against some imaginary foe. But of course the work of "preparation" will go right on, just as it has gone on in the past, as the figures I have given above clearly show. However, I am assuming that sanity will repossess the Nation at the end of the five-year period and that the program will therefore call for a total expenditure of only two thousand five hundred millions. On this calculation I have apportioned this cost upon the people of my district on the basis of population as shown by the census of 1910. In that year the population of that district was 313,868. It includes three counties—Bedford, Blair, and Cambria. The population of Bedford was 38,879; of Blair, 108,858; of Cambria, 166,131. This burden of \$2,500,000,000 means \$25 per capita. And it must be remembered that every dollar of it must come out of the toil and self-denial of the workers. Not one penny of it will come from the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow. Not a groat will be a fairy gift. The last mill will be produced by toil and will be collected by the taxgatherer. If this program shall be carried out it will cost Bedford County \$972,025; Blair County, \$2,721,450; Cambria County, \$4,153,875. But that I may bring the thing still nearer home, I show in the appended table the distributive share of the burden by the minor civil divisions, based on the census figures of 1910. The table follows:

	Population.	Amount.
Bedford County:		
Bedford.....	2,235	\$55,875
Bedford township.....	2,114	52,850
Bloomfield.....	673	16,825
Broad Top.....	3,752	93,800
Coaldale.....	311	7,775
Colerain.....	869	21,725
Cumberland Valley.....	996	24,900
East Providence.....	1,528	38,200
East St. Clair.....	1,122	28,050
Everett.....	1,725	43,125
Harrison.....	677	16,925
Hopewell.....	590	14,750
Hopewell township.....	1,261	31,525
Hyndman.....	1,164	29,100
Juniata.....	1,040	26,000
Kimmell.....	702	17,550
King.....	706	17,650
Liberty.....	1,574	39,350
Lincoln.....	410	10,250
Londonderry.....	1,260	31,500
Mann.....	830	20,750
Mann's Choice.....	341	8,575
Monroe.....	1,640	41,000
Napier.....	1,446	36,150
New Paris.....	194	4,850
Pleasantville.....	191	4,775
Rainsburg.....	203	5,075
St. Clairsville.....	101	2,525
Saxton.....	1,195	29,875
Schellburg.....	314	7,850
Snake Spring.....	728	18,200
South Woodbury.....	1,667	41,675
Southampton.....	1,056	26,400
Union.....	491	12,275
West Providence.....	1,781	44,525
West St. Clair.....	838	20,950
Woodbury.....	255	6,375
Woodbury township.....	809	20,225
Total.....	38,879	972,025
Blair County:		
Allegheny.....	2,065	51,375
Altoona.....	52,127	1,303,175
Antis.....	2,658	66,450
Bellwood.....	2,277	56,925
Blair.....	1,134	28,350
Catharine.....	1,071	26,775
Duncansville.....	1,263	31,575
Frankstown.....	1,939	48,475
Freedom.....	1,321	33,025
Gaysport.....	917	22,925
Greenfield.....	1,507	37,675
Holidaysburg.....	3,734	93,350
Huston.....	1,056	26,400
Juniata.....	5,285	132,125
Juniata Township.....	587	14,675
Logan.....	9,730	243,250
Martinsburg.....	920	23,000
Newry.....	380	9,500
North Woodbury.....	1,337	33,425
Roaring Spring.....	1,908	47,775
Snyder.....	2,458	61,450
Taylor.....	1,315	32,875
Tyrone.....	7,176	179,400
Tyrone Pownship.....	1,056	26,400
Williamsburg.....	1,523	38,075
Woodbury.....	2,129	53,225
Total.....	108,858	2,721,450

	Popula- tion.	Amount.
Cambria County:		
Adams.....	4,126	\$103,150
Allegheny.....	1,088	27,200
Ashville.....	384	9,600
Barnesboro.....	3,535	88,375
Barr.....	2,586	64,650
Blacklick.....	3,190	79,750
Brownstown.....	1,300	32,500
Cambria.....	1,150	28,750
Carroll.....	4,946	123,650
Carrolltown.....	1,348	33,700
Cassandra.....	306	7,650
Chest.....	668	16,700
Chest Springs.....	174	4,350
Clearfield.....	1,182	29,550
Conemaugh.....	1,549	38,725
Cresson.....	1,470	36,750
Cresson township.....	1,219	30,475
Croyle.....	3,376	84,400
Daisytown.....	382	9,550
Dale.....	2,285	57,125
Dean.....	599	14,975
East Conemaugh.....	5,046	126,150
East Taylor.....	1,049	26,225
Ebensburg.....	1,978	49,450
Elder.....	2,338	58,450
Ferndale.....	514	12,850
Franklin.....	2,102	52,550
Gallitzin.....	3,504	87,600
Gallitzin township.....	1,644	41,100
Hastings.....	2,125	53,125
Jackson.....	2,492	62,300
Johnstown.....	55,482	1,387,050
Lilly.....	1,638	40,950
Loretto.....	246	6,150
Lower Yoder.....	2,765	69,125
Middle Taylor.....	426	10,650
Munster.....	405	10,125
Patton.....	3,907	97,675
Portage.....	2,954	73,850
Portage township.....	4,614	115,350
Reade.....	3,093	77,325
Richland.....	2,103	52,575
Rosedale.....	1,119	28,475
Sankertown.....	687	17,175
Scalp Level.....	1,424	35,600
South Fork.....	4,592	114,800
Spangler.....	2,700	67,500
Stonycreek.....	2,293	57,325
Summerhill.....	863	21,575
Summerhill township.....	3,842	96,050
Susquehanna.....	4,266	106,650
Tunnehill.....	661	16,525
Upper Yoder.....	928	23,200
Vintondale.....	1,410	35,250
Washington.....	1,321	33,025
West Taylor.....	1,056	26,400
Westmont.....	1,468	36,700
White.....	599	14,975
Wilmore.....	314	7,850
Total.....	166,131	4,153,875

With these figures confronting them, I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, whether the people of the nineteenth district of Pennsylvania would sustain me were I to vote to fasten the program and its great burdens upon them. I am wondering whether, if the people of other districts throughout the country had similar figures presented for their consideration, other Members who may vote to fasten this program upon their constituents would be sustained. Of course no one can precisely know how the people feel about this great and costly plan. The President says he "thinks" the whole country approves it. Others sincerely question this fact. In the absence of accurate knowledge on the subject, why not refer it to the people themselves? The referendum is a familiar instrumentality in our Government to-day. It is embodied in one form or another in almost every State constitution in the Union. Why not employ it in this vital instance? Months ago I suggested this idea, and I am pleased to say that it has met with approval. Is there any insuperable reason why a joint resolution should not be adopted by Congress providing for placing the proposition on the ballot in November next? This proposition might very well take this concrete form, based on the moderate program of the President himself, a program, by the way, which excites the scorn of our jingo friends. Here is the definite proposition to be placed on the ballot:

REFERRED TO THE VOTERS BY CONGRESS.

Do you favor the general plan of increasing the Nation's Military and Naval Establishments, as proposed in the December 7, 1915, address of the President to Congress, namely: An increase in the Regular Standing Army from 108,008 (all services) to 141,543, and the creation of a volunteer enlisted citizen army of 400,000 men required to undergo discipline and drill not over two months a year for a three-year period; also, for the Navy, a five-year program of construction to provide 10 battleships, 6 battle cruisers, 10 scout cruisers, 50 destroyers, 15 fleet submarines, 85 coast submarines, 4 gunboats, 1 hospital ship, 2 ammunition ships, 2 fuel-oil ships, and 1 repair ship; and to enlist enough more men and educate more officers to man these ships, the total

increase of said national armament estimated to cost, in five years, \$500,000,000?

YES.

NO.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. WILSON of Florida having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to sell skins taken from fur seals killed on the Pribilof Islands for food purposes;

S. J. Res. 80. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point René W. Piató y Wentworth, a citizen of Cuba; and

S. J. Res. 81. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis Mr. Carlos Hevia y Reyes Gavilán, a citizen of Cuba.

The message also announced that the President of the United States had approved and signed, on January 18, 1916, bill of the following title:

S. 1230. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Fox River at Aurora, Ill.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] is recognized.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] use his time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

MEMORIAL ADDRESS ON THE DEATH OF GEN. GRENVILLE M. DODGE.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, as the years go by the shadows of death are fast closing over the heroes of the Civil War. One by one its great leaders have passed away, and recently the grim messenger summoned Grenville M. Dodge, the last general who commanded a Union Army in that contest. As he was at one time a member of this body and most distinguished both in war and in peace, I have thought it not improper to ask the House to lay aside for a short period the business in which it has been engaged in order that a tribute might be paid to his memory.

Mr. Chairman, great men arise from great occasions. The tremendous struggle between the North and South which convulsed this continent created and brought forth great souls. Out of this time of storm and stress rose in the North Lincoln, Grant, Sherman, Sheridan, and other mighty men, among whom was Gen. Dodge, whose ability, forcefulness, and genius was such that no history of that great conflict would be complete without their names entering into it.

Mr. Chairman, it was a distinguishing feature of that war that the great men whose names were inseparably connected with its history were not upon either side influenced by the motive of military fame. They found no pleasure in battle and sought neither reward nor glory. The surpassing valor which was shown on both sides and the priceless sacrifices which they made came from devotion to principle and not through any love of slaughter. Thus it followed that the great armies which were formed were not dangerous to the liberties of our people, and when the war closed many of those who had so much distinguished themselves in battle became preeminent in the upbuilding of the Nation through the arts of peace. Among those who had acquired fame as commanders and whose genius manifested itself notably in developing our national resources, none holds a higher place than Gen. Dodge. Here he is second to none.

Born April 12, 1831, at Danvers, Mass., and dying full of years and honors January 3, 1916, few men have seen so much of life and had so remarkable a career. Like most of our great men he came from the common people, but he graduated at a military university in a neighboring State, after which he took a course in engineering. At the outbreak of the war he immediately enlisted, was appointed a lieutenant, and served until its close. By sheer force of merit, without any support or influence, he rose rapidly through the grades to a major generalship. He was a friend of Lincoln, an adviser of Grant, the reliance of Sherman, the builder of the first Pacific railway, the partner of merchant princes, the associate of Roosevelt. All did him

honor and he was an honor to them. In his military services from the beginning he attracted the attention of his superiors by his marked capacity as an organizer and the vigor and energy with which he pushed to completion every task which was assigned to him. If a railway was to be reconstructed, if supplies were to be found, if additional troops were to be furnished, at a time when mistakes or delays were fatal, Gen. Dodge was selected to direct the work.

Two great events stand forth in his life and no reference to his achievements would be complete without mentioning them. One of these events was connected with the decisive battle of the Civil War, the other was one in which his leadership in both war and peace was conclusively demonstrated.

Mr. Chairman, in such a varied and strenuous career inevitably there came times when the bravest might have faltered and the strongest yielded to the strain; but his was a mind that quickened with responsibilities, and his genius ever rose with the greatness of the obstacles. Never was he greater than on that fateful day of the Battle of Atlanta, when with a suddenness that was stupefying there burst forth the thunder of artillery that shook the heavens itself, and out from a wood there rushed upon the rear and flank of the Army of the Tennessee a furious charge of the opposing forces with all the valor of men who are determined to conquer or die. The brunt of this terrific attack fell upon the Sixteenth Corps, of which Gen. Dodge was in command. In this appalling crisis, when his superior, Gen. McPherson, was killed and all looked to him for orders, when his ranks reeled and staggered under the apparently irresistible onset, when every moment some new and desperate emergency arose, the master mind of Gen. Dodge met the swiftly changing situation as calmly and effectively as if holding a counsel of war in his tent. The tide of battle was turned and the Union Army saved from a defeat so calamitous that words could not describe it.

Later in civil life when it was sought to build a transcontinental line through what was then known as the Great American Desert, the difficulties seemed unsurmountable. In this wild country, bands of hostile Indians roamed, which suddenly appeared out of some canyon or gulch, surprised and slaughtered the whites before they had an opportunity to resist, and then disappeared as if the earth had opened and swallowed them up. The engineers who began the work were driven away or killed. Laborers who had been brought together fled in terror. Teamsters could not be found to bring supplies, and the undertaking was suspended. It needed not only engineering skill but organizing and defensive ability of the highest degree to carry on its construction. Gen. Dodge was selected for the position of chief engineer and took personal charge of the operations. He hunted down and compelled the submission of the Indians, overcame the obstacles in the way of transportation, laid out the route, and supervised the construction of the road. It was a monumental achievement, which placed his name among the great builders of the Nation.

He served in this body in the Fortieth Congress, but commercial enterprises rather than a political life were to his taste and he declined a reelection. His admiring comrades of the Army, which he had commanded, elected him as president of the Society of the Army of Tennessee, a position which, although bringing neither power nor emolument, he seemed to value more highly than any he had ever held. He was also president of the New York Commandery of the Loyal Legion and president of the commission to inquire into the management of the War with Spain.

Personally, Gen. Dodge was modest and unassuming. In his great exploits he saw nothing of which to boast or to proclaim. Public spirited and philanthropic in the highest degree, no worthy object failed of his support, but it was never his desire that his benefactions should be made public. His interest in his home town of Council Bluffs never lessened. The great city of New York called him for many large enterprises and sought to lure him away, but he could not be induced to change his residence. The citizens of Council Bluffs will never forget his devotion to its interest, and that one of his last requests was that it should be his burial place. There where every citizen does him honor and every child is familiar with his achievements, among the hills that gave the city its name, not far from the spot where Lincoln and he had stood and selected the eastern terminus of the great railway he had constructed—there he was reverently laid to rest by the side of his old friends and comrades who had gone before.

Mr. Chairman, although the State of Iowa claims Grenville M. Dodge as her own and Council Bluffs was his home, such a man belongs not to any town or any State alone, but to the Nation. Monuments will be erected to his memory, but no marble or bronze will commemorate his achievements like the great railway whose bands of steel link the boundaries of our domain.

The time may come when this Government shall dissolve, its warriors and statesmen be forgotten, and the mighty works of its builders crumble into dust, but as long as the history of the period in which he lived is preserved the record of his achievements will exist, his place among the great men of this Nation will be fixed, and his fame forever secure. [Applause.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I was indeed interested in the speech of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILBERT]. He undertook to discuss this appropriation bill, and he let it come out very readily that he was not opposed to appropriations, but wanted it all to go into the pockets of the Steel Trust and the bunch over there from under whose smokestacks he comes, and wanted to wipe out all of the appropriations generally and to hold back for piling them all in for a big army and to be fitted up by his Steel Trust constituents. And next he amused me by saying that he was afraid of somebody coming over here and landing an army. I asked myself, "Who is likely to come here and land an army?" The only crowd that ever did was England, and we got out of our swaddling clothes and whipped her, and then we whipped her again before we cut our wisdom teeth, and I do not think she would come now. She does not have to. She has got Morgan serving as a resident envoy and minister plenipotentiary and has a judge advocate general in two Members from Massachusetts here on the floor. We are serving her as a base of supply now very nicely. She does not have to come. And Germany could not get here. And France has never wanted to come. She is too little to make much of a showing if she were to get here.

But over all this talk about German-Americans and Irish-Americans and the poison of the foreigner in this country I want to tell you when you will never hear any more of it. You let some foreign country land in this country with an invading army and there will not be a German-American here. There will be American Germans. There will not be any Irish-Americans, but American Irish; all the millions of loyal foreigners and the whole American citizenship will fall into a melting pot and come out militant Americans and they will march down like Abraham's army, 10,000,000 strong, and inside of a month one-half of that invading army will be in eternity and the balance of it will be begging God to save them from the wrath of outraged America. [Applause.]

I am not uneasy about their landing their troops. It is a pipe dream of those who feel the throb of war profits.

I have a few minutes left, and I want to say that the question of what I shall wear has become a national problem. [Laughter.] I have no antipathy or animosity toward the press gang. They can sharpen both ends of their pencils and punch me if they want to, but the New York World has seen occasion to put me up as a kind of a buffer while they very gratuitously seek to lambaste and belittle the farmers of Texas. And I want to say to the New York World that in Texas we have tarantulas, horned frogs, wolves, a whole lot of centipedes, and things like that. But all of them have never done us half as much harm as the New York World and the money changers of New York, and I am not going to let them lambaste farmers over my shoulder. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I just ask leave to extend my remarks in that connection in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, leave will be granted. There was no objection.

Mr. LONDON. Hit them hard now. [Laughter.]

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Thank you, my friend.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in the freedom of the press. Having owned newspapers for 17 years in Texas, during which time I had the honor of being president of the Texas Press Association, it is but natural that I should look upon the press as one of the great schools of progress and information. Yet when papers like the New York World undertake to use me and the clothes I wear to malign and slur the farmers of Texas by saying that these farmers had made me promise to never wear a collar in the event of my election to Congress, I say, with all kindness for the assiduous, erudite, and versatile young reporter, the World is carrying the esthetic taste of the eastern plutocrat a little too far.

Texas as a whole, leaving out myself, of course, will compare favorably in honor, honesty, morality, and ability with any

State in this Union, either in national politics or otherwise, and her farmers rank with the best people on earth.

It is true that many of them are poor, but when we consider them with the common man elsewhere, for 40 years under the domination of the money devil and money changers of New York, who have been the pets and partners of the New York World, it is much to their credit that they as farmers have been able to live at all.

Twenty years ago my elder brother, being subject to bronchial trouble, ruptured a bronchial tube while making a speech as district attorney and died of resulting hemorrhages. Physicians, in consequence, advised me to take good care of my throat and lungs, which I have endeavored to do by wearing in winter seasons what was then known as Waves mufflers.

This week I pulled off a silk muffler that cost \$1.50 and put on a 15-cent collar, and it became a national sensation. But for the benefit of the very delicate, fastidious sensibilities of the New York "gentry" and diamond-decked dudes who read the World I beg to say that I have little regard for the flummery, frills, flounces, and furbelows that the world calls fashion.

I think comfort, decency, and health should be the governing factors in the selection of all dress.

'Tis not the leaves upon a tree
That make the timber fine;
'Tis not the vestry preachers wear
That makes their lives sublime.

'Tis not the raiment people don
That makes a glorious state;
'Tis not the jewels in a crown
That make a kingdom great.

Right is right, for God is God,
And truth will make us whole;
The hope of man must ever be
The goodness of his soul.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] use the balance of his time?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I think this bill ought to pass. The gentleman from New York has no speech to make except his own and proposes to close the debate?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; that is all.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I, and how much time has the gentleman from New York?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has 14 minutes and the gentleman from New York 20 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Frankly, if I made any remarks in general debate, I would sooner follow the gentleman from New York than precede him. Really 14 minutes is not time enough for any Member of the House to discuss extensively any of the public questions now being considered throughout the length and breadth of the United States. At a proper time, if I can get the time and the spirit moves me and I feel that I really have something to say, I will seek the opportunity.

This is a bill called the urgent deficiency bill, proposing to give in round numbers \$12,000,000. In the main I agree to what is recommended by the committee and did agree when the bill was being made.

There are one or two items that I should have been glad to see in the bill but which were not included. There is one that I hope will go into the bill, but I can say in regard to it all I desire to say under the five-minute rule.

Now, if there is no gentleman who wants to submit some remarks during the remainder of my time upon this bill, I will yield the floor.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, it had not been my purpose to make any remarks upon this bill, but it seems perhaps appropriate, after what has occurred, that I should make a very brief statement in reference to it.

This is a bill to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year 1916 and for prior years. It carries \$12,500,000. The estimates submitted were for sums aggregating \$13,565,000.

Three gentleman representing the minority, who are members of the Committee on Appropriations, have occupied the major portion of the time allotted to debate. They are not only members of the Committee on Appropriations, but they are three men of the longest service in the House of Representatives, and can fairly be said to rank among the most distinguished Members of the House. None of them has pointed out a single item in this bill that is subject to criticism. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] devoted almost an hour to a criticism of the Democratic Party for extravagance in the expenditure of public money, and he took up a discussion that was begun some time last month by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] as to the relative defenselessness of both parties with respect to the charge of extravagance. But he did not find it necessary to call attention to a

single item in this bill, carrying \$12,500,000, as an evidence or indication of extravagance on the part of the Democratic Party in its present control of the House.

I take this attitude of these distinguished gentlemen as an additional compliment to the very effective and efficient committee over which I have the honor to preside. It demonstrates that whatever may be said in the heat of political discussion about the conduct of the finances of the Federal Government, there has not been during the five years in which the Democrats have been in power in this House any just ground for criticism of the Committee on Appropriations for extravagance or improper action regarding appropriations for the support of the Federal service.

While this bill carries \$12,500,000, very little of that money can be considered in the nature of deficiencies in appropriations to supply the needs of the various services. For instance, \$250,000 is appropriated to pay a treaty obligation with the Republic of Panama. Under a treaty with that nation \$250,000 is to be paid annually in perpetuity as part of the purchase price of the rights of the United States in the Canal Zone strip. That is one of the outstanding obligations of the Republican administration to which I referred when I answered the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], for which provision has been made in this bill and has been made during the five years in which the Democrats have been in control of the House.

Three million five hundred thousand dollars is for work in connection with construction of public buildings authorized at various times by Congress. Without any increase of force, the Supervising Architect's Office has been so much more efficient under a Democratic administration than it was under a Republican administration that it has so speeded that office up that this year it is turning out 99 buildings instead of 65 buildings as originally estimated. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And because of the speeding up of the program heretofore authorized by Congress, it becomes necessary to make provision for carrying on and completing the work on many buildings at an earlier date than originally was anticipated.

Two million four hundred and forty-eight thousand dollars is for the Postal Service. The Post Office appropriation bill failed of enactment at the last session of Congress. A continuing resolution, which made available sums similar to the sums appropriated for the Postal Service for the fiscal year 1915, was enacted in its place. As a result the department has had less money available for the various services than was agreed upon by the conferees representing the two Houses in charge of the Post Office appropriation bill. So far as my recollection goes, in no instance does the amount carried for the Post Office Department make, with the amount provided by the continuing resolution and what is carried in this bill, a greater sum than the amount agreed upon by the conferees on the Post Office bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. What are the particular items of deficiency in the Post Office Department that are provided for in this bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. There are a number of them.

Mr. MANN. They are mostly for transportation.

Mr. MADDEN. I was going to say—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Railway transportation is a very large item; electric and cable service, purchase of twine and binding twine.

Mr. MADDEN. The department reports very large unexpended balances in a great many branches of the Postal Service, and I was wondering whether they had the right to come before the Committee on Appropriations for urgent deficiency appropriations under those circumstances.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They do not report any very large unexpended balances in these items, except the item for railway-mail pay, and that is not an urgent deficiency; but the appropriations that are available are somewhat more than a million dollars less than will be needed to make payments, and, as the estimates were transmitted at this time, the item was included in this bill rather than carried over into the general deficiency bill, so that the payments might be made promptly.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Under the circumstances I take it that there will be further deficiencies in the Post Office Department?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That was not inquired into outside of the items before the committee, and on some of these items it is quite possible that there will be further deficiencies.

Mr. MANN. I should assume that extending the appropriations of the prior year would not be sufficient to take care of the Post Office Department for the current year, with the addition of these items. I should think it would be much more than these items before the year is over.

Mr. FITZGERALD. These are the items as to which the department stated that there was necessity for immediate appropriations, and the investigation seemed to disclose that that was correct.

Mr. MADDEN. I think the First Assistant Postmaster General's division of the Post Office Department reported something like \$5,000,000 of an unexpended balance in the salary account of the clerks, carriers, postmasters, and supervisory officers, notwithstanding the fact that he was operating under the appropriation of the year before; and, of course, that was largely due to the fact that he had reduced the compensation of a great many men from the figure provided by law to an arbitrary amount which he fixed upon his own authority.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Still, there are no items in the bill, as I recall, that come under the First Assistant Postmaster General.

In the Department of Agriculture there is \$357,000, of which \$57,000 is to reimburse appropriations which have been drawn upon because of the necessity of employing labor to fight forest fires. Three hundred thousand dollars is an emergency appropriation to combat the citrus-fruit canker, which is very prevalent in the citrus fruit growing States. One hundred and sixty thousand dollars is for the Bureau of Standards, to complete the chemical laboratory within the limitation fixed by law and to equip the building which will be completed very shortly. Two hundred thousand dollars is to make repairs to aids to navigation which were very seriously injured as the result of several cyclones on the Gulf during the present fiscal year, and \$67,000 is to replace life-saving stations which were completely destroyed or very seriously injured as a result of the same storms.

Then there is an item of \$210,000 to pay judgments of the Court of Claims, \$59,000 to pay Indian-depredation judgments, and \$924,000 to pay audited claims certified by the accounting officers under the law.

These items aggregate in all \$10,305,000, so that the sums carried here which actually represent deficiencies are very small.

Mr. Chairman, I do not often indulge in political discussions as to expenditures by the Federal Government, or as to the manner in which its revenues are obtained; but the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] made one statement to which attention should be called. He said he did not criticize the Democratic Party for spending the money so much as he did for not obtaining the revenues to meet the expenditures, and that the Republican Party has always enacted legislation to provide adequate revenues to meet any expenditures it has made.

The gentleman overlooked one very important fact, and that is that during a period of three or four years the Republican Party supplemented the moneys received from its revenue-producing legislation, to the extent of \$134,000,000, from the proceeds of bonds issued under the legislation affecting the Panama Canal. There have been expended on account of the canal sums aggregating \$240,000,000, for which bonds under the law can be issued in order to reimburse the Treasury, and if the Democratic administration followed the policy initiated and adopted by the Republican administration, of reimbursing the Treasury on account of expenditures for the construction of the Panama Canal, and issued Panama Canal bonds so as to put into the Treasury \$240,000,000, there would be little heard from the Republican side of the House as to the actual balance of available cash in the Treasury at any time.

Mr. GILLETT and Mr. LONGWORTH rose.

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will yield first to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT].

Mr. GILLETT. I should like to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that while the Republicans were in control they averaged more payments for the Panama Canal out of the general fund of the Treasury than the Democrats have paid out of the general fund for the same purpose?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is not my recollection.

Mr. GILLETT. My recollection is that they did.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They did not issue any more bonds in order to reimburse the Treasury on account of the expenditures that were made, because they were not permitted to continue in power. There is not any doubt that if the Republicans had remained in control of the Federal Government the bonded indebtedness of the country would have been very greatly increased, probably by \$200,000,000, and some future Democratic Congress would be doing what this Democratic Congress is doing, raising and paying about \$4,000,000 annually as interest

upon the bonds issued by the Republican administration. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GILLETT. Will the gentleman let me finish?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. GILLETT. During the last two years you paid out of the Treasury about \$20,000,000 a year for the Panama Canal, did you not?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have not got the figures in my mind. I do not know.

Mr. GILLETT. That is a fact. I think one year it was \$19,000,000 and the other \$21,000,000; and I will venture to say that in the previous years, after we began the canal, when the Republican Party was in power, we averaged much more than \$20,000,000 a year out of the Treasury, to say nothing of the bonds.

Mr. FITZGERALD. When the Republicans saw that they were to continue in power they replenished the Treasury by the issuance of the Panama Canal bonds, to reimburse the Treasury for the expenditures on account of the canal. When they saw the handwriting on the wall, when they knew that they were about to get the judgment of the American people for their years of misdeeds, they expended these enormous sums out of the general fund in the Treasury, and instead of reimbursing the Treasury and leaving the money available for the Democratic administration they refused to issue the bonds, and now they cry out that we have created the deficit. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

So that if more money was expended during the years the Republicans were in power than when we were in power, it only emphasizes the statement that the present condition is due to the gross mismanagement of the Republican Party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I desire to ask the gentleman a question touching the revenue, and I ask merely for information without any political motives. Can the gentleman state what action the party of which he is one of the ablest and most competent leaders is about to take with reference to following the recommendation of the present Secretary of the Treasury for retaining the duty on sugar?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Ohio is mistaken. I am not one of the responsible leaders of the party. [Laughter on the Republican side.] More than that, if the gentleman will content himself with patience he will find what the program of the Democratic Party is to be. Whatever it is, there will be no such conditions as resulted during the administration of a distinguished Republican President—a native of Ohio—during my service in the House. No Democratic President will ever send a message to Congress that it is their plain duty in the interest of justice and humanity to enact certain legislation for the relief of the people brought under our flag, and have our party, because of the greed and avarice of the manufacturers, refuse to carry out the recommendations of the President.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I desire to thank the gentleman for his categorical reply. [Laughter.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the gentleman wish to ask me a question or tell me something? [Laughter.] I will yield for a question, but I will not have any remarks of mine filled up by gratuitous inaccurate statements of Members on the Republican side of the House. [Laughter.]

Mr. FORDNEY. With all due courtesy to the gentleman, I want to ask him a question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Very well.

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman made a statement that I want him to correct.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, I will not permit the gentleman to correct what is already perfect.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman permit me to state the question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Does the gentleman from New York desire more time?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; if I can have time not only for the gentleman from Michigan to ask his question but time to answer it.

Mr. CANNON. I will yield the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman from New York made the statement in reference to the expenditures out of the general fund for the construction of the Panama Canal. During the Republican administration up to the 3d of November, when the

Democratic Party enacted the tariff law, there have been expended out of the general fund, and in addition to the sale of bonds, \$191,000,000 on the Panama Canal. In addition to the \$191,000,000 there were spent \$138,000,000, which included premiums and the proceeds of the sales of the bonds, and yet, under the Democratic administration you have not sold any bonds, but you have spent \$77,000,000 since that time. We left you \$149,000,000 in the Treasury and you only have about \$40,000,000 left.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I heard the gentleman from Michigan make that same statement in his remarks on continuing the war-revenue act. There is only one unfortunate thing about it, it is so tainted with error that it is not correct. [Laughter.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman state wherein I have erred?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have not the time now. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Oh, it is easy for gentlemen to laugh; but I will make one statement to show that the gentleman is in error. I will not state views, opinions, or notions; I will state official figures. The gentleman said that we have expended \$77,000,000.

Mr. FORDNEY. Since the 3d of October, 1913, up to the 10th of January, 1916.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman's figures do not jibe. He must have been reading Republican statements and imagined that they were Democratic statements. There were \$134,000,000 of bonds issued and \$240,000,000 of bonds available. The expenditures for the canal up to the present time are \$378,000,000.

Mr. FORDNEY. The Treasury statement shows \$390,000,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I know the statement I make is accurate, because I have looked up the figures to put them in a report on a bill.

Mr. MADDEN. That does not include what has been expended for fortifications.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No.

Mr. MADDEN. I suppose the figures of the gentleman from Michigan include that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It does not, because they are always carried entirely apart. There are \$240,000,000 of bonds that can be issued to reimburse the Treasury on account of the expenditures of the Panama Canal. The \$240,000,000 were obtained to replace and reimburse the Treasury. It would give \$149,000,000 that he is worried about—

Mr. FORDNEY. It is not me that is worrying.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This side of the House has not been weeping and walling at the condition of the Treasury as have gentlemen on that side of the House. They seem to imagine that they are still in control of the Government, and they have restless nights and uneasy dreams, and then they come in here and give voice to them on the floor of the House. It may help them to sleep easier, but it does not alarm the country or disturb this side of the House at all. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. EMERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. I see there are 49 or 50 items in the post-office division which are marked for commencing post offices. Have they been ordered before or are they ordered by this bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. These are buildings which they have reached for construction upon which no work has been yet begun. After sites are acquired and buildings authorized, the buildings are listed and taken up in their order. A number of buildings will be taken up which it was not anticipated would be reached. This bill carries the money that it is believed will be necessary on account of the work on these buildings between now and the 30th of June.

Mr. EMERSON. Then they were ordered by a previous Congress?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC BUILDINGS, CONSTRUCTION, SITES, AND RENT.

For sites, commencement, continuation, or completion of public buildings within the respective limits of cost authorized by law, severally, as follows:

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 11, page 4, insert the following:

"Provided, That the appropriations for construction of public buildings made herein shall not be expended for commencing work on any building unless a contract therefor shall have been entered into prior to the passage of this act."

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], remarked that no member on the minority side had said a word in criticism of this bill, and he assumed from that that consequently we were all in favor of every item of the bill. That did not follow at all, and the gentleman, if he had reflected, would have known that there are some items in the bill to which I objected. But I am ready to admit that the Committee on Appropriations, in my opinion, does do more for economy than any other body of men in the House. I admit that I am not unprejudiced and perhaps my partiality for my own committee may lead me to think that, but the figures which the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] placed in the Record in his speech about a year ago, I think, fully substantiate the fact that somehow by precedent, which has come down through many years, there is an instinct of economy in the Committee on Appropriations, no matter which party controls, which, I am sorry to say, does not prevail throughout the House in general.

Here is an economy, Mr. Chairman, which the present Committee on Appropriations might have initiated. My amendment practically provides that no new building for which a contract has not already been let shall be begun in the coming year. That would save this year about \$2,000,000, and the buildings which it would cover amount in the whole to some \$7,000,000.

I do not wish now to suggest or go into the question whether appropriations for these public buildings were extravagant or not when the public building bill was passed. My only argument to-day is that in the present diminishing condition of the Treasury, in the deplorable lack of revenue, compared with the enormous emergency expenses which the administration has recommended, it is a time when the majority party ought to suggest that we do without some luxuries and get along on the plain necessities of life. It seems to me that new public buildings, desirable as they are to all of us individually, and possibly—although I do not wish to go into that—justifiable on public grounds, ought not to be entered into at this time of deficiency and stress, and it is for that reason that I offer this amendment, so as to give an opportunity which the gentlemen on that side seem to think the minority never does, and to point out to them a chance for that economy on which they so plume themselves.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment is very clear to the Members of the House. If adopted, no money that is carried in this bill on account of the construction of buildings will be expended contracts for the construction of which have not been made prior to the approval of the bill. These estimates were transmitted to the Congress and referred under its rules to the Committee on Appropriations. For the fiscal policy of the Government I am not responsible. Whatever views I might have as to the desirability or advisability of recommending expenditures for any particular purpose at any particular session of Congress, I have no control or part in the submission of the estimates. I do know, however, Mr. Chairman, that during my entire service in this House, regardless of the control of the House by either political party, there has been an overwhelming majority in favor of appropriating such sums for the construction of public buildings as are requested and stated by the Treasury Department can be utilized with the time covered by the appropriations to be carried in the particular bill. Not only has there been an overwhelming majority in favor of such appropriations, but I have been strongly of the suspicion that there has been a very substantial majority in favor of appropriations in excess of those requested and those recommended by the Committee on Appropriations.

In charge of this bill, under the uniform and unbroken practice of the House for half a century, I am charged with the obligation of explaining exactly what effect particular amendments may have, and with protecting the bills as spokesman of the committee. The members of this committee now understand the purpose of the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET], and it remains with this committee to determine whether the policy suggested by him shall be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Burlington, Wis., post office: For continuation, \$500.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Where an appropriation of \$500 for "continuation" is made, is it because we made a previous appropriation of \$500, which was not sufficient for plans?

Mr. FITZGERALD. On what page is that?

Mr. MANN. Oh, there are a number of them.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is for the work in connection with the preparation of the survey of the site, to enable the plans to be prepared. I think that is so in most instances.

Mr. MANN. This is for "continuation." We frequently make an appropriation of \$500 or \$1,000 for surveys, and for the preparation of plans, but where we make an appropriation for the continuance of a work for \$500—

Mr. FITZGERALD. The word "continuation" would be used if the original authorization was for a site and building, but if the site were provided independently, the wording would be a little different.

The Clerk read as follows:

Yoakum, Tex., post office: For commencement, \$15,000.

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out line 8, on page 16. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill if he can tell us why it takes the Treasury Department three years to select a public-building site when there is really no dispute about it?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is a matter of administration, and I can not speak for the Treasury Department on matters of administration.

Mr. DILLON. Can the gentleman give any information on the subject, of why it should take so long to select a site in the absence of any dispute about the subject?

Mr. FITZGERALD. All might be in agreement on a site that would be a good one for everybody but the Government to have. For instance, I have heard it said that a site was sold to the United States in a western town which was completely covered by water. It might be everybody in that place was in perfect accord that it should be sold if anybody could be found foolish enough to buy it, and the United States Government probably was the only possible purchaser that could be induced, under any circumstances, to buy such a site.

Mr. DILLON. I would like to ask the gentleman—

Mr. FITZGERALD. But I am not in a position, let me say to the gentleman, to answer questions regarding the various departments of the Government which involve purely a question of administration. I am not administering them, and I am consulted very little about how they should be administered. I am not in a position to explain or advise regarding their motives and purposes.

Mr. DILLON. I would like to ask the gentleman one other question, and that is if the gentleman does not think the real purpose of the delay is not to withdraw funds from the Treasury that have already been appropriated?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, I do not think much about any of those things that do not come to me; but, judging from what happened since this Congress has met, and the fact that this bill is carrying about \$3,000,000 of buildings that it was not believed would require money until after the beginning of the next fiscal year, and that provision was made in here for 22 buildings that it was not believed would be commenced within the next fiscal year, or before the 30th of June, 1917, it would not appear that the Treasury Department has been attempting to delay the work of public buildings for the purpose of preventing the withdrawal of money from the Treasury of the United States on that account.

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say in this connection that I think there are many of these appropriations made for public-building sites in the selection of which as much time as three years has passed and the Treasury Department failed to make any selection. Somebody ought to be able to explain why it takes so long to select a site.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Why does not the gentleman ask the officials of the Treasury Department?

Mr. DILLON. I have, and I am told the reason why is that they do not wish to withdraw the money from the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired, and, without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Vaults and safes: For vaults and lock-box equipments and repairs thereto in all completed and occupied public buildings under the control of the Treasury Department, including the same objects specified under this head in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1916, \$10,000.

Mr. RICKETTS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I notice this bill, on page 10, item 20, contains an appropriation for a public building at Logan, Ohio. I am delighted with the amount set out here, and I take it for granted that additional appropriations will be made as occasion demands. The building is in process of construction and has

been for some time, and the people of that city are very desirous of having this building completed at the earliest possible date under the contract.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will tell his constituents that they should appreciate the efficiency of this office under a Democratic administration and show their appreciation at the next election.

Mr. MANN. They will show their appreciation of the gentleman who gets it in the bill—the gentleman who just previously addressed the House. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Improvements and repairs: The unexpended balances of the several appropriations for the construction of the bridge across Rock Creek on the line of Q Street, including the approaches thereto, contained in the District of Columbia appropriation acts for the fiscal years 1912, 1913, and 1914 are made available until June 30, 1916.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Why is it necessary in the matter of appropriations to make these old appropriations for the Q Street Bridge available until the end of this fiscal year? In other words, why are they not available now?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, it is due to a decision either of the auditor or the comptroller that because a contract was made at a time between the making of the appropriations they could not pay the contractor, this man West. They are to make some additional contracts, and the question has arisen again. They made one contract which contained a provision that payment should not be due until the appropriation is made by Congress.

Mr. MANN. I am very willing to make the appropriations available. I think the buffalo they have up there are the finest things I have ever seen in statuary.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, I have seen them just as bad in the past and expect to see them a great deal worse in the future.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman usually sees and hears lions roaring over in New York, where they keep a herd of them, or tigers, where they are felt over in New York [laughter on the Republican side]; but these are American bison.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pay: For pay of the Army, including the same objects specified under this head in the Army appropriation act for the fiscal year 1915, \$1,200,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 19, in line 25, strike out the sum "\$1,200,000" and in lieu thereof insert the sum of "\$1,199,772.62."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I think this is real Democratic economy—you have cut down 25 cents.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no.

Mr. MANN. What, not that much?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know whether it is due to the gentleman's inability to either add or subtract, but there is a difference of something like twenty-eight dollars and something.

Mr. MANN. I said 25 cents; I was only off a few dollars.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This is to correct an error in the total of the deficit in the pay of the Army.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the chairman of the committee what is the cause of this large deficit in the pay of the Army?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, there were a number of causes. They had more officers and men than they expected to have during the fiscal year and they did not have enough money with which to pay them.

Mr. TILSON. Were there more men enlisted than they anticipated when the estimates were made?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Some more; yes.

Mr. TILSON. An increase in the Army caused by enlisting more men?

Mr. FITZGERALD. To some extent; and also it is stated by Gen. Aleshire that the appropriation was not sufficient for the number of men for which the estimate was submitted.

Mr. TILSON. Was the entire estimate last year appropriated for?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Three hundred and fifty-five additional men in the Hospital Corps; and the deficit in the pay of officers was due to the increase of officers because of the act of July 18, 1914, increasing the number of officers in the Signal Corps by 60. They had 16 more officers on an average than were anticipated when the estimates were submitted. Then

there were \$26,586.72 due to an increase in the number of men drawing pay in the Philippine Islands and Alaska. They get the foreign-service pay, which is 10 per cent, I think, in addition to the regular pay. Then in the Corps of Engineers, pay of officers, there was \$1,420; payment made to enlisted men on discharge for clothing not drawn, \$528,663; interest on soldiers' deposits, \$25,675; three months' additional pay for reenlistment, \$132,035.

Now, those are things that can not be estimated for with any degree of accuracy, and the sums mentioned were needed in addition to the amounts requested and appropriated by Congress.

Mr. MANN. I can give the gentleman the information he asks for, if he has not already secured it.

Mr. TILSON. I have not received any information on the items, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MANN. The amounts appropriated for the fiscal year were \$429,575.58 less than the estimates on these items.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] does not understand what the gentleman from Connecticut desires. I was giving him the information furnished—the actual figures making up the deficit, furnished by the Quartermaster General.

Mr. MANN. But the appropriations were less than the estimate. I saw that the gentleman did not get the information, and I gave it.

Mr. TILSON. My attention was attracted to the item because of its magnitude.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is not large at all. During the last year of the Taft administration my recollection is that the deficit in the appropriations for maintenance of the Army aggregated \$2,900,000, and the statement of the representatives of the War Department before the committee were to the effect that they were directed to request less money than they knew would be actually required. That situation has not happened under a Democratic administration.

Mr. MANN. Every year it is just the same thing.

Mr. KAHN and Mr. FITZGERALD rose.

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] yield?

Mr. TILSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] for any information that he has on the subject.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am informed on that subject, for I asked the questions and got the answers from men who were serving under the Republican administration.

Mr. TILSON. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. KAHN. So far as the deficiency appropriation in the last year of the Taft administration is concerned, to which the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] has referred, I want to call his attention to the fact that in that Congress the Democrats had control of the House. They cut the estimates suggested by the War Department to such an extent that subsequently it became necessary to appropriate the amount named by the gentleman from New York to make good the deficiency. That is the way that large amount came into this House. It was because of the failure of the Committee on Military Affairs, under Democratic control in the House of Representatives, to appropriate enough money to pay the Army, and likewise to cut the appropriations for other purposes of the Army.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Now, Mr. Chairman, so that there will be no misunderstanding of what happened, I will state that the last year of the Taft administration, when the House was Democratic, the deficit was \$2,900,000. It was stated some time a little later in the session that the men who prepared the estimates of the amount of money required for the various purposes of the Army were directed, and against their protest were compelled, to make estimates which they informed the President were insufficient to meet the obligations.

Now, in the last year of a Republican House the deficits for this purpose that were submitted and supplied by Congress aggregated \$1,800,000. The gentleman's statement about a Democratic House coming way below the estimates and not supplying enough money to carry on the service is just one of those idle, vain pieces of buncombe, which, I regret to say, so many of the gentleman on that side of the House have been indulging in since this session of Congress convened.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman is quite correct in what he says about the estimates having been cut in the War Department at the request of the President; but I still maintain that those

estimates were still further cut, cut below a safe figure, by the Democratic majority of the Committee on Military Affairs when they reported out the bill. And the Democratic majority in the House approved that cut over the protest of the minority, who predicted there would be a deficiency if the cut were made.

Mr. TILSON. May I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Certainly.

Mr. TILSON. Did not the committee deliberately cut the estimates furnished last year by \$425,000?

Mr. FITZGERALD. My committee?

Mr. TILSON. The Military Committee of last year.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know what happened within the Committee on Military Affairs; and if I did, I would not be permitted under the rules of the House to state it.

Mr. TILSON. I mean in the bill they brought in.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I can say for the committee over which I preside that the practice is to recommend the sums that it is believed are actually required for the proper conduct of the various services of the Government, regardless of what the totals may be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment now pending, offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let the gentleman speak on the amendment pending.

Mr. MANN. Yes. I will move to strike out the last two words of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt whatever, and we might as well be frank about it, that the Democratic side in the Sixty-second Congress, going into the presidential election, cut estimates quite freely where they knew the money would be expended, in order to make a very good showing about what they had appropriated, knowing that they would have to make deficiency appropriations thereafter. I have no doubt in a way that in connection with the so-called Smith amendment the same thing was more or less in the mind of President Taft. All committees may do that at times. The truth is, however, that amidst all the talk about extravagance and economy the fact stands out preeminently all the time that the administrative officers of the Government under every administration are grossly extravagant in their demands.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Add "practices" and I will agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Well, I do not know what the addition means.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I say, "Add practices" and I will agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Well, demands and practices. I am willing to make the addition. [Laughter.]

We hear a great deal of talk about what they call a national budget system, if anybody knows what that means. I do not know, and I have never been able to get a statement from anybody that claimed that he knew, a statement that was intelligible on the subject. But if there be any need of a national budget system, we have it now established, if the administrative officers would endeavor to practice economy. Every year Congress cuts down the estimates submitted to it by the administration under every administration, and the only place where economy is practiced under the Government is in the House of Representatives. It is not practiced in the administrative offices, and it is not practiced at the other end of the Capitol.

I think that amidst the criminations and recriminations between the two sides of the House as to which has been the most extravagant we might properly put some of the fault upon those who have been at fault instead of assuming that it all belongs to one side or the other of this House. The House, while it becomes very extravagant at times, while many Members of it are always willing to vote for every expenditure and against every proposition to raise revenue, still in the main wants to be fairly economical, and every committee of the House in charge of appropriations finds that its principal business is to resist the demands of the administrative officers and those outside of the Government service for larger appropriations. It is not here where the extravagance is started. The extravagance starts outside and finds its way here from the outside, and we try to resist the demands as well as we can.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVAL ESTABLISHMENT.

Bureau of Construction and Repair: For construction and repair of vessels, including the same objects specified under this head in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1916, \$48,950.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, there are included in this item two items under the Naval Establishment which provide for additional money in the Navy Department for draftsmen and an amount of money for making plans for battleships in the proposed naval program which is now being considered in the Committee on Naval Affairs, and it is not, of course, a deficiency. I do not believe that we ought to anticipate in the appropriation of money what Congress may or may not authorize hereafter.

It is true that in the hearings you will find that a portion of this money is to be used, as is contended by the Navy Department, in making plans for two ships now under construction; but there is about \$14,000 or \$15,000 in the two items—I have not the exact amount here before me—under the Naval Establishment which ought not to go into this bill.

It is utterly impossible for the subcommittee to absolutely segregate the items so as to determine just how much the Navy Department intends to use or needs on the two battleships now under construction, and for that reason I want the items eliminated, so that the Navy Department will ask for the additional draftsmen which they need for the work now under construction, so that Congress will not be placed in the attitude of making appropriations, having drafts made, and plans made for ships that may never be authorized.

Now, I am not going to take the time of the committee to read the hearings, but if you will take the hearings and read Admiral Griffin's testimony you will find that it is stated at that time that the need of these additional draftsmen was due largely to the fact that they were anticipating a program which was being considered by the Committee on Naval Affairs of this Congress; and for that reason, Mr. Chairman, I move that this item be stricken from the bill. I reserved that right in the committee to make the motion. In the event that that is not done, then I want to reduce the item by the amount, as nearly as possible, that will be used for that purpose on new naval construction.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend. page 21, by striking out the paragraph beginning with line 2 and ending with line 5.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the testimony before the committee does not show that any of the sum carried in this item is to be utilized in the preparation or performance of work in anticipation of any ships to be authorized hereafter. Congress at the last session authorized two battleships, No. 43 and No. 44. Proposals were invited for the construction of those ships. The bids submitted by the private contractors were so much in excess of the limit of cost fixed that the Secretary of the Navy, under the authority conferred upon him by the naval appropriation bill, directed that the vessels should be constructed in two of the Government yards.

Admiral Taylor, the Chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repair, in speaking of this item, made the following statement:

Part of the money was to be used for draftsmen in the two yards; the balance of it here in the bureau in Washington.

He was asked whether the amount to be used was on account of anticipated legislation. He stated that the building of these ships in the two yards necessitated the preparation of all the plans from the beginning. He says the material has already been contracted for, and that deliveries will commence within six months from December 1, 1915. In order to have the material delivered, certain plans must be prepared in advance, so that the material can be turned out and sent to the yards on schedule.

In the testimony of Admiral Griffin, the Chief of the Bureau of Steam Engineering, it appeared that for 15 or 20 years the practice of the Navy Department has been to do certain preliminary work in connection with the plans for ships that have been suggested or proposed in advance of the legislation authorizing the ships.

This work must necessarily be done in advance or else after the ships are authorized a very considerable delay will take place in the preparation of plans, the obtaining of bids, and the construction of the ships. The number of ships does not materially affect the work to be done, but work is done in the preparation of preliminary plans upon ships of general types, in order that the work may be utilized after it has been prepared. This practice has prevailed in the Navy Department for a great many years.

Mr. BUTLER. I understand this is only for temporary employees in the Navy Department, is it not?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is only for the balance of the current fiscal year. Additional draftsmen, however, will be required in the two navy yards during the construction of the ships that are assigned there. For instance, the Mare Island yard has had assigned to it a battleship for construction. There are between 2,000 and 2,500 detailed working plans. These plans are prepared as the work on the ship goes on. The mechanics can not do their work until these plans are ready, and it requires a very large additional number of draftsmen to be employed during the period the ship is under construction, so that the plans can be carried on coincidentally with the progress of the work. Admiral Taylor stated that there was a delay of about six months in the launching of the *Arizona*, which was constructed in a Government yard, because of the lack of the necessary draftsmen to keep the plans prepared up to the progress of the work on the ship.

These men are per diem employees. Their services seem to be necessary. These ships are authorized and are to be built. It is an economy to build them as rapidly as possible, because we have a very considerable amount of money invested in them lying idle, and the overhead charges are a very considerable item. So far as the testimony goes, of these two items aggregating \$86,000 there may be used in Washington in the Bureau of Steam Engineering on some preliminary work in connection with ships not yet authorized the sum of \$4,250. It does not permit the employment of a very large number of draftsmen, and regardless of our views as to the number of ships that should be added to the Navy, if any ships are to be authorized at this session of Congress, then additional draftsmen are necessary to do the preliminary work as has been the custom since the Government has been engaged in building modern war vessels.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. If this Congress should order only two ships built, will these draftsmen be needed, and will the department need this appropriation?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Therefore it does not follow that it is in anticipation of a 4, 6, 8, or 10 ship program?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It does not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the estimates which the Secretary of the Navy transmitted to Congress through the Secretary of the Treasury provide in regard to this item:

Pay of additional draftsmen and other technical assistants needed to expedite the preparation of designs, contract plans, and specifications of the vessels which have been recommended to be included in the naval appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1917.

Then, there is an item about vessels 43 and 44. Then, in addition, for the purchase of equipment and supplies and the rental of quarters for the additional force referred to in the item which I first read.

If it be true—and I have no doubt that the statement made by the gentleman from New York is correct, since he makes it—that it has been the custom of the Navy Department to prepare plans and specifications for vessels before they have been authorized, I think it is a custom that ought to be abandoned. It is news to me. The department for many years has recommended more vessels than were finally authorized. I think there is no year in which a number of vessels—not always battleships, but other vessels—have been recommended which have not been authorized. And if it be true that the department has gone ahead, out of appropriations not intended for that purpose, and has provided the plans and specifications for these vessels which were never authorized, it has been an extravagant waste of money, whoever did it. Now, as far as I am concerned, I am going to vote this year for—well, I think I will wait until I make my speech on that subject before I state how many vessels I am for. But I can see no reason why we should go ahead and give to the Navy Department specifically an appropriation to prepare plans for vessels which have not been authorized, and which may not be authorized.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think the gentleman understands the situation. The General Board is engaged continually in the study of the development of war craft.

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The estimates submitted to Congress requesting the authorization of battleships of certain types are supplemented with information as to the size of the ships, the size of the guns, and their general characteristics. In order to reach those conclusions, to make the necessary studies preliminary to these recommendations, a very considerable amount of drafting work is necessary in connection therewith.

Mr. MANN. They have reached these conclusions in regard to the vessels which we have just authorized. They have not only finished reaching the conclusions, but they are putting the conclusions into effect. Now, if they want a sum of money to make investigations, they have that all the time. A part of this appropriation is for plans, and so forth, for ships 43 and 44, the contracts for which have just been let, or are about to be let to the navy yards. They are up to date on that. If they are not, those battleships ought not to be built.

Mr. FITZGERALD. None of the working plans are prepared yet at all.

Mr. MANN. Very well, that gives away the case. I am in favor of giving them the money to do that; but if, when they have just made a contract for the most modern battleship that is to be built, they are going to learn something new to-morrow, they had better wait until they let that contract. I do not know whether they have let the contracts, but they have received the bids.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They have decided to let the contracts.

Mr. MANN. They have decided to let the contracts, one in California and one in New York, on battleships that are supposed to be up to date if anything is. They are supposed to represent the best wisdom of the world in battleships now. They are preparing the plans and specifications for those ships. What do they need money for—to prepare plans and specifications for some other vessels to submit to Congress this month or next month?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I saw a statement that it was likely to press on the Committee on Naval Affairs the advisability of authorizing battleships of 36,000 tons rather than 32,000, with a main battery to consist of 16-inch guns instead of 13 and 14 inch guns, as at present.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman mean to say that they are going to prepare plans and specifications for battleships in advance of their authorization?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They do certain work and they have been doing it. It is not something that is new or peculiar to this situation. It is considered current work that has been done for 15 or 20 years.

Mr. MANN. But this item does not cover that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman is mistaken. I read the estimate as it was transmitted, and it occurred to me that it was a very unusual proceeding to ask for money to prepare plans and specifications for ships in advance of their authorization by Congress. Admiral Griffin spoke of the sum required for steam engineering, and said \$4,250 was desired to be used for the purpose. Admiral Taylor, speaking for the Bureau of Construction and Repair, did not say it was for such a purpose, but did say, in the conduct of the working of the Bureau of Construction and Repair for the past 15 or 20 years certain preliminary work on the plans had always been done before Congress had authorized any ships whatever.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt there is certain preliminary work always done before they make the recommendation, but for that they have a regular appropriation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It all comes out of this appropriation.

Mr. MANN. They have \$9,000,000, and they have always paid it out of that appropriation, and they can pay it now.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, the \$9,000,000 is in the general item, and there is a limit put on that as to how much can be used for draftsmen. It amounts to hundreds of thousands of dollars, but it is limited both in the naval and the legislative bill.

Mr. MANN. That is true, of course.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there can be any question but that the item was asked for, and it was in the mind of the two admirals that came before this committee that that was the chief reason for asking for it. Take the \$10,000 item for the purchase of certain tables for draftsmen which they have been needing for a long time and needed to perfect working plans for the two battleships 43 and 44, one to be built in California and one in New York. They said they needed the tables for that purpose, and certain other furniture in the office. While being examined on that question all of these items were in the minds of the committee. Now, on page 114 of the hearings you will find Admiral Griffin's statement, as follows:

Admiral Griffin. We want to get the money as soon as we can, so as to proceed with this program.

The Chairman. Which program?

Admiral Griffin. The one the Secretary has outlined.

The Chairman. The one the Secretary has recommended?

Admiral Griffin. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. But that has not been authorized?

Admiral Griffin. No, sir.

The Chairman. You want to go ahead with it before it is authorized—is that it?

Admiral Griffin. Well, we have got to do a lot of preliminary work on these ships. The program carries eight or nine different types of

ships; and if we waited until the bill passed, it might be 18 months before we would be able to advertise the ships.

The Chairman. Suppose there are no ships carried in the bill?

Admiral Griffin. Then, of course, the time would be wasted.

The Chairman. You are asking us to anticipate that Congress is going to authorize certain vessels?

Admiral Griffin. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. You want \$2,500 for that?

Admiral Griffin. That is for the Bureau of Steam Engineering.

The Chairman. What is that for?

Admiral Griffin. That is for equipping the drafting rooms with drawing tables, filing cabinets, drawing instruments, calculating machines, and other office equipment, which we estimate to cost \$2,500.

The Chairman. How long would it take to equip those rooms?

Admiral Griffin. Oh, two weeks, perhaps.

The Chairman. You would not need this money until the money for the new program becomes available?

Admiral Griffin. Oh, yes.

The Chairman. Why?

Admiral Griffin. Well, if we waited until the new program is available we would lose just that much time in preparation.

The Chairman. But you can not start on these ships until they are authorized by Congress?

Admiral Griffin. A great deal of it has to be done ahead—a great deal of it.

The Chairman. Before they are authorized?

Admiral Griffin. Yes, sir; we have to do a great deal ahead of time.

The Chairman. For what purpose?

Admiral Griffin. So that we will not delay the advertising of the ships.

Not only that item, but the items I am asking the committee to strike out, are to be used, or nearly all, in anticipation of what Congress may do.

Let the committee also keep in mind that all these employees in the city of Washington are provided for in the legislative bill that comes from this committee, but the draftsmen who work in the navy yards are paid by the Naval Committee. The last Naval Committee that considered the naval program made provision, or is presumed to have made provision, for what is needed to carry out the work that we authorized in that bill; so I think it is indefensible for money to be expended in any department of the Government in anticipation of what Congress may or may not do. The preliminary work they speak of is work that has to do with the type of vessel. That work is done in the city of Washington.

No detail plans and specifications are prepared, no working plans are prepared, but they simply agree on the type of vessel. For until an examination reaches that point it was nowhere intimated in this record that they needed to use it on these vessels that are being constructed in the mind of the Secretary of the Navy as proposed to Congress. Therefore I feel that the item ought to be stricken out. Nor do I feel that there will be any such delay as is contended for, because it is not conceivable to my understanding, if the naval bill shall go through in a few months, how it could delay the building of the vessels in the new program. It might delay it from now until the bill authorizing the vessels is passed, but why should you anticipate what Congress may do? It seems to be a total disregard of the right of Congress to control these appropriations. It was suggested in committee that they might take all the draftsmen and use them on the preliminary work and then come and ask us to give them an appropriation for draftsmen to do the work that they now have in hand. I do not presume that any department of the Government would do that, because if that is done Congress will find itself in doubt where the money has been spent for something not authorized.

The Chairman. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, it is the duty of the President to make to Congress such recommendations as he deems proper. To do that intelligently, especially touching the construction of battleships and cruisers of different types for the Navy, he should have some knowledge either himself or in the proper department. What kind of a fix would he be in if he recommended various ships and vessels without proper knowledge of what was required? You would call on the Executive or the Navy Department for information—what do you know about it? I do not know anything about it. How much will it cost? I do not know. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me, and that is what I gather from the evidence, that for 20 years past this practice has obtained of making plans for vessels not authorized, so as to be able to give information to the Executive, whose duty under the law it is to communicate to Congress such recommendations as he sees proper to make. I became satisfied, and I am now, that this appropriation ought to be made, and I agreed to it, and I hope that the amendment will fail. Of course, if ships are authorized, then when the contract is let, and it can be let without the working plans being made, according to our information, the working plans must be made and made promptly. There are certain ships—if I recollect correctly, two of these great battleships—that are authorized. Those working plans ought to be made promptly, and there ought not to be delay of months for the lack of sufficient drafts-

men to make the working plans, as in the case stated by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words. It is true that the last Congress last March did order the construction of two large ships of war, of 32,000 tons each. This action was in last March. It was anticipated then that within a few months the keels of these ships would be laid, and if there was any protection to be afforded by the construction of these ships, that the American Nation might have that protection speedily given it. But the keels have not yet been laid. Information has been given the Committee on Naval Affairs that they will not be laid for some time to come, six months at least, perhaps nine months and maybe a year. A ship is on one of the ways and has to be taken off before another can be put on. The *California* is on the ways in the New York Navy Yard; a second ship has been assigned to the navy yard at Mare Island. Ways must be provided in that yard before this ship can be constructed. The gentleman from Illinois is entirely correct. When estimates are submitted to the committee, the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Construction and Repair both indicate to the committee the design and character of the ship that it is desirable to have added to the Navy. Preliminary plans are made, and from those plans—I have seen them at times—we endeavor to reach a conclusion as to the character of ship. But the real working plans are not made until after Congress acts. Complaint is frequently made here and elsewhere of the delay in making the plans for ships after they are ordered by Congress.

This delay is supposed, Mr. Chairman, to delay the construction of the ship. I believe, from what I know, that the preparation of these plans has at times greatly delayed the construction of the ships, and if these are the plans for the two ships we provided for a year ago, I would earnestly ask this committee to agree to this provision of the bill and make this appropriation of money. It seems plain to me they are. Do not let it be understood that I am advocating, directly or indirectly, a great program for the Navy. I reserve to myself the right to conclude in the end and after much consideration what I shall do in that respect. But if this money asked here is to hasten the construction of these two great men-of-war authorized a year ago, let us have these plans made, and let everybody employed for the purpose help to work them out. To relieve the apprehension of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson], although he is a member of the Appropriations Committee and would know more of the subject than I do, I believe that it was intended by Admiral Taylor to ask for enough money to employ draftsmen to work on these two ships already authorized. I read from his statement, to be found on page 119 of the hearings:

Admiral TAYLOR. Of that \$48,950, \$19,700 is for expenditure for services in the Bureau of Construction and Repair of the 29 additional draftsmen; the remaining amount is for expenditure for draftsmen necessary at the New York and Mare Island Navy Yards in connection with the construction of battleships No. 43 and No. 44.

The CHAIRMAN. How much is that?

Admiral TAYLOR. \$29,250, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The \$29,250 is not on account of anticipated legislation, is it?

Admiral TAYLOR. No, sir. The last bill authorized the Secretary of the Navy to construct these ships in the navy yards, and in order to prepare the plans and push the work it is necessary to have an increase in the drafting force.

Admiral Taylor then proceeds in his statement before the committee to say that the shipbuilding in the New York yard requires the attention of draughtsmen already employed, and that the other ship to be built there to immediately follow the *California*, which is now on those ways, would require the employment of additional draftsmen. Furthermore, additional draftsmen will be needed in the navy yard in California, where No. 44 is to be built. I think No. 44 goes there. It seems to me it is not in anticipation of a much enlarged program for the Naval Establishment that this amount of money is asked, and let me suggest to gentlemen here, having had some knowledge of naval affairs as a Member of this House, this is not a drop in the bucket compared to what will be required if the program recommended by the President of the United States shall be adopted by Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I now move to amend this section by striking out the figures "\$48,950" and inserting the figures "\$29,240," reducing the appropriation \$19,700.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 21, line 5, strike out the figures "\$48,950" and insert "\$29,250."

Mr. Sisson. Now, gentlemen of the committee, this gives to the Navy Department every cent that Admiral Taylor said was necessary to do the work on the two battleships now on the ways, and the \$19,700 is the money which would be used on the proposed new program not authorized by law.

Now, I was willing in the committee, and am willing now, to give to the Navy Department every penny that they want for this work, which it is authorized by this Congress to do and to expend, but I am utterly unwilling that they shall expend one cent on a program which may or may not be authorized. That matter ought to be handled by the Committee on Naval Affairs. It is in no sense of the word a deficiency, and we give to them all that they need under the present program.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. The President of the United States, as the gentleman knows, has recommended that four great ships of war be provided.

Mr. Sisson. Yes. I have a great deal of respect for the President of the United States, but I am not willing to represent a people and then permit him to assume the duties and functions of Congress on any matter. I think Congress ought to always retain its control over appropriations and the expenditure of money.

Mr. BUTLER. But I am not asking the gentleman to remove that control; I will assist him, so far as I am able, in maintaining it, but this program is recommended, and without committing ourselves to it, does not the gentleman think it is but fair that the President of the United States or the Secretary of the Navy should have an opportunity to prepare the preliminary plans for these big ships? There may be two of them; maybe there will be but two recommended by the committee and maybe there will be but two agreed to by this House; but is it not fair to the department that it should have sufficient money to prepare these preliminary plans?

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further. Ah, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman need not be uneasy about preliminary plans. That Navy Department will give all the preliminary plans the Committee on Naval Affairs want. They will not have to have this \$19,700 to prepare those plans. Let not the gentleman give himself any uneasiness about that matter. They will get all the preliminary plans that are necessary to have. What I am inveighing against now is that the department, without any warrant or authority, so far as the law now exists, and if you segregate the items and put this \$19,700 in a separate item it will be subject to the point of order, because it is not authorized by law. But they put it in one item which has been authorized by your committee, to wit, to build the two battleships now under construction. It is a bad practice, to say the least of it, for the Navy Department, or any other department, to endeavor to take advantage of Congress and put upon them the necessity of withholding what the department may need in order that they might get what the department does not need because of the uncertainty in the item as to exactly how it is all going to be spent.

Here we have the testimony of Admiral Taylor, which the gentleman just read to the committee, in which he states specifically that this amount of money is needed on the two battleships now under construction, or soon to be under construction; and then it follows that this \$19,700 is to be used on the proposed naval program which the Secretary of the Navy has offered to this House. I therefore ask the committee to adopt the amendment and give them all they need for the battleships and for the program now authorized by law, but not give them a penny for that which may or may not be authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] will not prevail. If this amendment be adopted, the money necessary to employ draftsmen in the two yards in which battleships No. 43 and No. 44 have been assigned for construction will be provided, but no money will be available to add additional draftsmen in the bureau at Washington. There is no doubt in my mind, and the Bureau of Steam Engineering and Construction and Repair very frankly stated, that the purpose of obtaining this money is to employ draftsmen for the purpose of expediting the construction of whatever ships may be authorized at this session of Congress. If this money be not voted at this time and these men employed, it will delay for 18 months the invitation for proposals for the construction of these ships that may be authorized. Regardless of what number of vessels may be authorized, whether the largest number suggested by the most extreme big-navy man or the smallest number suggested by the most radical against any great increase in our naval force, I am convinced

that whatever vessels are authorized should be constructed as speedily as possible, and this appropriation is to enable that to be done.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. In just a moment I hope. If any reason whatever exists for additions to our Navy, large additions or small additions, the necessity that exists for those additions requires the construction of those ships rapidly and the putting of them into condition to be used, and there will be a delay, and a long delay, in the construction of the vessels unless this force for employment in the department at Washington should be authorized. Now, it would have been easy for the Navy Department to have concealed this fact. This estimate could have been prepared and advocated in a manner that would not have disclosed that; and it was for the purpose of obtaining draftsmen to expedite the preparation of plans for ships to be authorized or contemplated at this session of Congress. The estimate is submitted in a form to compel the money to be used for that purpose, so that there will be no misunderstanding of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER]?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Did the gentleman learn in these hearings that it was proposed by the Navy Department to change the style of the ship and therefore, I presume, more elaborate plans would have to be made?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Admiral Taylor made the statement. I asked him. I said that the estimates have been submitted to Congress, and therefore these draftsmen could not be needed to prepare plans in order to enable the department to prepare the estimates. The statement is that the estimates are of a very tentative character and they wish to reduce them to more definite and substantial form in order to more intelligently discuss what the department desires to do. It is not possible for any men, no matter how competent they may be as naval architects, to give an estimate or to form any opinion that is of any value whatever as to a ship and its characteristics without some comprehensive preliminary plans which can be studied to determine displacement, the speed possibilities, and the ability of the ship to carry guns, ammunition, coal, fuel, and other things that mean weight.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Just a moment more. These men ought to be in a position, whatever Congress does regarding the proposed naval program, to carry out the will of Congress in as expeditious a manner as possible, and build whatever ships that may be authorized as quickly as may be.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I am at a loss to understand just how, if the naval bill passes in the next four or five months, it would delay the construction of these ships 18 months. That is a remarkable statement to make, because it simply means that the draftsmen will be authorized there as soon as the ship is authorized by the naval bill, when it passes the House and passes the Senate, and whatever the delay may be between now and then, the time of its passage will be the only possible delay. Now, if it is so urgent as that, they should put this item in an urgent deficiency bill. Why not put the proposed battleships in the bill and authorize them now? I see no such urgent need, such untimely and undue haste, to get hold of this money.

Now, it is true, as I have understood, that they have demanded more draftsmen in the past than the Naval Committee would give them, but I do not believe it is the function of this committee or any other committee of the House, especially a deficiency committee, to overrule the decision of the Naval Committee, which is presumed to know what it is doing and, I presume, know more about the naval bill and what is in it than a deficiency committee making a short investigation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The part of this item that the gentleman proposes to strike out is the additional sum that would be given to the department in addition to what is carried in the legislative bill, and the part that remains in is the addition to the amount that is carried in the naval bill.

Mr. SISSON. That is true; but there is no necessity for it at this time, as I conceive it, unless this committee is willing to anticipate, as the Navy Department did, that we are going to get it anyway. Let the legislation be harmonious. Let the committee of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], who has just spoken, take jurisdiction of this matter, and let him handle it and put it all in a bill together. Then you will know how many draftsmen you will need. I do not know, nor does the gentleman here know, whether they have made provisions for draftsmen in addition to the regular appropriation

or not—draftsmen to take care of four, five, six, seven, or any other number of ships. They have not gone into that matter. That is a matter they decline to go into. They do not know how many ships are going to be authorized, and yet they come and ask for this sum of money.

Will they prepare plans for one, two, three, four, five, or a dozen ships that may not be authorized? They do not know. I think it is an unwise, and so far as Congress is concerned an unfair, method of spending money until you know for what ships, for how many ships, and what will be done with the money.

By the way, I do not suppose it is a very sacred thing to you gentlemen when you go to appropriate money, but it is a little sacred when you try to collect it from the people, and they have to pay it. We ought to have more regard for the Treasury than to pay out money for the employment of draftsmen that may do work upon ships that are never authorized. For example, they might expend \$19,700 on plans and specifications for battleships that would never meet the approval of the Committee on Naval Affairs or of Congress, and the money would be squandered and thrown away, because Congress may not authorize the very battleships that they ask to be authorized.

For that reason I hope the committee will reduce the item down to what is actually needed under the program authorized by law and under construction.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 36, noes 45.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bureau of Steam Engineering: For engineering, including the same objects specified under this head in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1916, \$38,620.40.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out this item. I do not desire to discuss the matter, because the same reasons that applied to the former item apply also to this one.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to expend the two foregoing amounts for the services of draftsmen or other technical assistants for the purpose of constructing battleships Nos. 43 and 44 in certain United States navy yards and of expediting the preparation of designs, contract plans, and specifications of new vessels, being additional to the sums authorized for such personal services in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1916.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the language of this section. Beginning with line 14, after the word "yards," strike out the following language: "And of expediting the preparation of designs, contract plans, and specifications of new vessels." Strike out the language that I have read, ending with "vessels."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 21, lines 14 and 15, by striking out the following language: "And of expediting the preparation of designs, contract plans, and specifications of new vessels."

Mr. SISSON. Now, Mr. Chairman, by eliminating that language you will leave the amounts as they are, but the Navy Department would not then be authorized to use any of this money in the preparation of plans for ships not authorized by law.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that it might be a good thing to have a little test vote in the House. We have had a good deal of talk about those who were in favor of enlarging the Navy and getting the country in the proper state of preparation. A great deal of applause on the Democratic side was given to some few gentlemen who have spoken against preparedness. Now, we are going to have a show-down. Those who are in favor of a little Navy at this time will vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi. Those who are not in favor of a little Navy, but are in favor of some little preparation for national defense, can vote against the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi, and we will have a rising vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. MANN. I ask for a division, Mr. Chairman.
The committee divided; and there were—ayes 6, noes 65.
So the amendment was rejected.
The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.
The Clerk read as follows:

Alaska Engineering Commission: For carrying out the provisions of the act approved March 12, 1914 (38 Stat., p. 305), entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," to continue available until expended, \$2,000,000.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, beginning on line 7, strike out all of the paragraph down to and including line 13.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to waste the time of the House in offering hopeless amendments, but inasmuch as the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] succeeded a few moments ago in reducing an appropriation of \$2,000,000 to \$1,999,978, I am encouraged to point out to him an opportunity to make a real, substantial saving.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. COX. I want some information. What has been done under this paragraph already?

Mr. GILLETT. They have begun work there. They have expended about \$2,000,000, I think, on the work. They have bought a road, you know.

Mr. COX. How much of a road did they buy? What road did they buy?

Mr. GILLETT. A road of 35 miles, I think.

Mr. COX. What did they pay for that?

Mr. STAFFORD. They have paid down \$1,150,000 and the balance is \$650,000.

Mr. GILLETT. They have paid, I understand, over a million dollars.

Mr. COX. Are they actually constructing the work on this road?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes. I understand they are proceeding favorably with the work. They expected that they would have to bring their labor up there, but I understand they have found the labor there, and they are at work.

My opposition to this paragraph is not on that ground.

Mr. COX. I want some information. I have not looked the matter up.

Mr. GILLETT. I am not on the subcommittee that has charge of this legislation.

Mr. COX. I understand the Government has bought 70 miles of road already. Is that correct?

Mr. LENROOT. I understand the Government has paid down \$1,750,000.

Mr. COX. The Government has constructed some road in addition to what it bought, has it not? How much?

Mr. GILLETT. They have graded about 35 miles, I believe, and built about 10 miles. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] may be able to inform the gentleman exactly.

Mr. CANNON. I think they have graded about 35 miles. That is my recollection of the hearings.

Mr. GILLETT. I do not base my amendment on the ground that this work is superfluous, but regardless of the advisability of building this railroad, I simply offer to that side of the House a proposition and an opportunity of economy. When the Treasury is suffering, when we are losing millions of dollars every month, when we have recommendations for enormous emergency appropriations which must be given, there has got to be some method of providing the money. I think one method would be to cut off all kinds of luxuries, and admitting that this is desirable and most commendable, upon which I do not wish to express any opinion, yet unless that side of the House has some proposition by which they are going to bring in adequate and abundant revenue, of which I am very skeptical, I think they had better begin to save this year by cutting off luxuries.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Suppose this item is stricken from the bill, how will it affect the Government work there? Will it occasion any loss to the Government?

Mr. GILLETT. It would undoubtedly occasion some loss. The construction has begun to a certain extent. The road we bought is not in good condition, but in very poor condition.

The road of 10 miles which we have constructed would probably deteriorate—it would be some loss—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. GILLETT. I ask, Mr. Chairman, for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I would say that it would not be two millions only saved. This \$2,000,000 is for work for this fiscal year, but the administration has recommended an appropriation of eight million and some hundred thousand for the next year, and consequently what is in issue here is over \$10,000,000. If we are going to stop at all we had better stop now and do nothing till the Treasury has more funds, but if we are going to go on next year we had better not stop work now and begin again next year. So the only reason for adopting this amendment would be on the theory that we were going to wait until the Government had sufficient revenue to afford us the reasonable luxuries of life. It does not seem to me at the present that we are in that condition or that there is any reasonable expectation of it in the near future. I do not believe the party in power is able to put us in that condition, and so I suggest, as one of the means of helping the Treasury, to strike out this appropriation and then not continue it in the next regular appropriation, but to wait until we are in a financial condition where we can afford to spend money in hastening our territorial development.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the day I had occasion, after the gentleman from Massachusetts had spoken, to call attention to the inadequate method of determining extravagance by using simply totals. The gentleman himself has furnished a splendid illustration of the futility of that sort of consideration. If this railroad is to be built, this money should be appropriated. Of course if the gentleman from Massachusetts believes that the railroad ought not to be built and that we have wasted what has already been done there, he is quite within his rights and reasonable in his position in denying any additional money. But for those who believe it should be built to now deny the money would not be economy, although it might make a good showing in the totals. The question of showing that seems to the gentleman the most desirable thing to accomplish irrespective of whether you have an actual economy or not. The fact is, if the work is to be economically prosecuted the money must be available now. The fact is that a good deal of material can be transported in winter over the ice cheaper than after the ice breaks up. Another fact is that you would lose economies through the dispersing of your workmen who are there now. In fact, all the reasons that would actuate a business man conducting in a businesslike way an enterprise of this kind require an appropriation for carrying on and maintaining this work. The gentleman's theory of economy consists in reducing present totals only, and I congratulate him on giving such a good illustration of what I said this morning.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky seems to think that striking out \$2,000,000 is a matter of totals. It is a matter of expenditure. There are plenty of people who would like to have something but can not, first, because their salaries are too small, like ours, or for other reasons which prevent the purchase of them. I suppose that was what was in the mind of the gentleman from Massachusetts. However, Mr. Chairman, I rose to call the attention of the House to what seems to me a peculiarity in the matter of submitting an estimate. Under the law the head of a department prepares an estimate of appropriations to be submitted to Congress and then transmits it to the Secretary of the Treasury, who transmits it to the Speaker of the House. I hold three of these estimates in my hand—one for the item now under consideration of \$2,000,000 for the Alaska Railroad, one for the increase in the Navy Department, which we have just been discussing, and one for the deficiency in the pay of the Army, which we were discussing a little while ago. The Army estimate comes to us signed "Lindley M. Garrison, Secretary of War," and is addressed to the honorable the Secretary of the Treasury, with no one's approval. The one for the Navy comes to us signed "Josephus Daniels," and under that "The White House, approved, January, 1916," without anyone's signature. That shows that that estimate was submitted to the President and was marked "approved" by the White House, but the President was not earnest enough about it to add his signature. The estimate for the Alaska Railroad comes to us, "The President, The White House. Earnestly approved, Woodrow Wilson."

Mr. Chairman, you can take your choice. The President does not approve the estimate for the payment for the deficiency in the pay for the Army. He approves, but will not sign, the approval for the increase in the Navy, to prepare plans for new battleships, and he "earnestly" approves the expenditure of \$2,000,000 for the Alaska railroad, which, I suppose, probably unknown to him, is mainly for the purpose of paying the Guggenheims or Pierpont Morgan or some one else—I do not know who it is—for the railroad in Alaska which we have agreed to buy, and which we ought to have. I do not know just where the President draws the line, and I do not know that it is the President who draws the line. Probably he does not keep track of these things, but it does seem odd to me that, of the estimates submitted to Congress for appropriations, some of them are not submitted to the President and he does not approve, some of them he approves but does not sign the approval, and some he earnestly approves and adds his signature.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, in these matters of receipts and expenditures it is interesting to note some of the difficulties which we find ourselves up against. We embarked upon the proposition of the income tax which the people did not want, and now find that in order to raise revenue we will have to continue that tax and probably extend it. Then we imposed a war tax upon the people, which nobody wanted, and now find that in order to carry out the programs that have been decided upon we must extend that war tax and continue the burden which the people do not like to bear. In the matter of the customs revenue, we find that from the point of view of the other side it is very much easier to levy a direct tax upon the people of the United States to pay for our various enterprises than it is to levy a tax at the ports of entry on the goods that are manufactured in foreign countries, thus making the foreigner pay the tax for the benefit of the consumer in the United States. In the matter of the Alaska Railroad and this appropriation we are now up against the proposition of having gone into an expensive enterprise, involving the expenditure of some \$30,000,000, which at the time it was discussed in the House seemed to indicate that we were going to expend of the people's money about \$1,000 for the benefit of every white man in Alaska, assuming, of course, that the money was to be for the benefit of Alaskans only.

I did not approve the project at the time it came into the House, because, it seemed to me, considering the financial status of the country and the fact that the Democratic Party was not altogether a constructive party, that we had better reserve our funds for such purposes as good roads in the United States, which we badly need for the benefit of the farmer, as we heard yesterday, and for the improvement of waterways, long neglected, before we ever suspected we had any assets in Alaska at all. I opposed the measure at the time because it seemed to me to be a project that might very well wait for a year or two until we could take care of some of our own needs in the United States, and I thought possibly the 30,000 white men up there might give in a little bit to the 100,000,000 of people in the United States proper until we got a few things here that we actually needed in the way of public improvements. But so long as we have gone into it and the majority has made itself responsible for the expenditure of at least \$30,000,000 to buy these railroads that did belong to the Guggenheims and others, who were very much assailed in previous Congresses, I do not see very well how we can get out of it since we have already expended a million dollars or more and have started on the work. That which we have undertaken I suppose we ought to carry through, leaving the responsibility where it belongs.

One of my constituents, an active business man and an energetic hunter, has been in Alaska several times, and in a communication to me he has a good deal to say about the resources of Alaska. In order that his views on that subject may be set before the House, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the House by incorporating his letter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The letter is as follows:

Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I have made two trips to Alaska in the pursuit of big game and I contemplate going again this spring.

These journeys have opened my eyes to the enormous mineral and agricultural wealth of Alaska and of its marvelous fisheries. This Territorial wonder until recently has had but poor help from Congress; in fact, it has been harassed in many sorts of ways in place of having been helped. The last Congress, however, made a notably good start by deciding to build a Government railroad from Seward to the Tanana

River, which will enable it to get to Fairbanks—the metropolis of the far North.

Now that a real start has been made to do justice to this mighty Territory, I hope that you will do what you can to push the work along.

The administration has asked Congress to appropriate \$10,456,000 for Government improvements in Alaska for this year.

What little I have seen of the Alaskan Territory confirms me in the belief that with the help of Congress and of the Government, as noted above, and with the transportation facilities as now projected finally completed, a wave of unexampled prosperity is bound to set in, which will not only help Alaska itself, but it will have the reflex action of being helpful to the whole of the United States.

Since the purchase of the Territory in 1867 Alaska has given the Nation a grand total of \$533,195,587, and for this enormous amount the Government has only contributed about \$24,000,000 over and above the revenues collected in 47 years.

If every Member of Congress should spend, say, two or three months in the Territory and see for themselves what an untold wealth will be bound to follow the improvements now in process of being carried out, they would realize that to give Alaska her rights would in the end be productive of good to every State in the Union.

Very truly, yours,

THOMAS MARTINDALE.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a statement about the Alaskan Railroad to-night. I do not want the statements that have been already made in reference to the amendment to go by without a statement of the facts.

Congress authorized the construction of a railroad in Alaska at a cost of not to exceed \$35,000,000, and directed the President to select a route from some all-year open port at tide-water to the interior of Alaska on the navigable waters of Alaska, and if he determined to purchase any existing railroads in Alaska to pay not to exceed the appraised value of the railroad. The route selected is from Seward, Resurrection Bay, to Fairbanks. The Alaska Northern Railroad, 71 miles in length, from Seward to Kern Creek, a distance of 71 miles, has been purchased for \$1,150,000. The work was commenced at Cooks Inlet and at Anchorage, a right of way has been graded for 35 miles, and tracks laid for a distance of 15 miles. There was available for the work \$3,000,000. The money has all been expended. There are at Anchorage between 500 and 1,000 men who were engaged upon the work, and who will be reemployed if money be made available to utilize their services. An appropriation is urged at this time particularly because it is desired to carry the work from Matanuska River, a point to which the grading has been completed, a distance of 35 miles, for 40 miles farther to the Matanuska coal field, and in addition to do some work on what is to be the main line toward Fairbanks, to commence work from Ship Creek Junction along Turnagain Arm toward Kern Creek, so as to connect the Alaska Northern Railroad up with this part of the work that is being done.

If the money is now appropriated, supplies can be taken up to a supply station along the line of the Matanuska coal fields over the ice at a cost of about a cent a pound. If the money be not available until after the ice goes out, it will be necessary to pack supplies on pack horses. The limit will be about 150 pounds to an animal, and the cost will be about 8 cents a pound. A certain portion of the work can be done much better and more economically during the winter season than in the summer season. Unexpectedly favorable labor conditions enabled the commission to carry on the work much more expeditiously than was originally anticipated. Under these conditions it would seem to be the part of wisdom, if this road is to be constructed at an estimated cost of \$27,000,000, to provide the money to enable the work to be done as expeditiously as possible. There are certain overhead charges which go on regardless of work being done, and the greater the force that can be employed, the greater the work that can be done with the existing organization and the more economically the work will eventually be done. It is not economy, Mr. Chairman, to deny this appropriation at this time. It would be deferring an essentially public authorized improvement to a later day at a very considerably increased cost. I can understand why my colleague on the committee favors this policy. About January, 1915, former President Taft wrote a series of articles for the Saturday Evening Post upon the efforts of his administration to effect economy in the public service. He said that in order to do so he had declined to permit to be submitted to Congress estimates for a number of very important and essential public improvements which had been authorized, which, in his opinion, should have been carried out, but in order to effect certain economies he had deferred them unto a later day; and, although this had been done, the estimates submitted by his administration during that Congress were \$72,000,000 in excess of the sums actually appropriated. That is a false economy. That does not save anything. Like the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET], I was one of those who did not believe the United States should commence the work of building Government railroads in Alaska.

PHILADELPHIA, January 13, 1916.

That question has been settled. That policy has been fixed, and the wise and economical thing to do is to provide adequate funds to enable the work to be completed as rapidly as possible. Within 18 months it is anticipated that the Matanuska coal field, to which the work is to be carried under this appropriation, will be opened up, and this coal is the coal which has been examined, analyzed, and determined to be particularly valuable for the use of the Navy. Certain select portions of the coal lands are to be reserved for the Government, and the more speedily this coal becomes available the more quickly can very considerable savings be effected in the cost of fuel for the Navy upon the Pacific coast.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Let us go home.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I wanted to ask whether or not the Matanuska coal was not the coal that the Navy tests proved to be not sufficiently powerful to use in the Navy?

Mr. FITZGERALD. There were two expeditions to this coal field. The results of the first tests were not satisfactory. It was said that the coal had been taken in such quantities and in such a way that a fair test had not been possible. The result of the second test is that the coal is of a very fine quality and adequate for naval purposes.

Mr. MADDEN. Was there not a statement made at the time these coal tests were made to the effect that all warships were being built now to consume oil instead of coal, and that coal would not any longer be a factor?

Mr. FITZGERALD. There were statements to that effect, but the great bulk of the naval vessels now use coal. The cost of transporting coal from the Atlantic seaboard to the Pacific seaboard is very much in excess of the value of the coal itself.

Mr. MADDEN. I agree, if they are going to use coal, they should have that coal.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We contribute \$6,000,000 annually for the transportation of coal. I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARRISON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9416) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the bill H. R. 7617, the good-roads bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the road bill. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I shall not object. This is the second time we have granted leave to our distinguished friend from Indiana to-day to extend remarks, but they are always good.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. OLNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the dyestuffs situation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLNEY] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the dyestuffs situation. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate joint resolutions of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. J. Res. 81. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis Mr. Carlos Hevia y Reyes Gavilán, a citizen of Cuba; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. J. Res. 80. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point René W. Pintó y Wentworth, a citizen of Cuba; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE FOR SUNDAY, JANUARY 23.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] to preside next Sunday at the memorial exercises for the late Representative GOULDEN.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Friday, January 21, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6229) granting a pension to Burnetta K. Bradford; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1334) granting an increase of pension to Frances M. Hammond; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5898) granting a pension to John W. Munsell; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2976) for the relief of Patrick H. Murphy, alias Henry Watson; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 1539) granting a pension to James Duffy; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2975) granting an increase of pension to Ernest A. Cephas; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7496) granting a pension to Hugh Fitzgerald; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8745) granting a pension to Antoni Oltmann; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 9520) to repeal section 4716 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 9521) to amend section 245 of the Criminal Code to include motion-picture films; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9522) to enlarge, extend, and make additions to, fireproof, and further improve the post-office building at Shenandoah, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9523) authorizing the expenditure of \$50,000 for the erection at Appomattox, in the State of Virginia, of a monument or memorial to the restoration of peace; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. McCracken: A bill (H. R. 9524) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to subdivide the southeast quarter of section 18, township 46 north, range 4 west, Boise meridian (the same being that portion of the town site of Plummer, Benewah County, Idaho, not yet platted), into 5-acre tracts for sale, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: A bill (H. R. 9525) to establish a national park in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 9526) to provide for the erection of a public building at Lenoir, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 9527) to amend section 3 of an act to create a legislative assembly in the Territory of Alaska, approved August 24, 1912, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9528) for the protection, regulation, and conservation of the fisheries of Alaska; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DENT: A bill (H. R. 9529) to promote the safety of travelers and employees upon railroads engaged in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9530) to promote the safety of travelers and employees upon railroads engaged in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9531) to provide for the acquisition of a new site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of Montgomery, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 9532) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Morganton, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 9533) to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 9534) granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers, and officers who served in the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM (by request): A bill (H. R. 9535) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 9536) to regulate the sale of beverages containing alcohol in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 9537) to levy and collect additional income taxes, and to provide revenue for the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9538) to amend an act entitled "An act to increase the internal revenue, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAY of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 9539) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-culture station in Mobile County, Ala.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 9540) authorizing a preliminary survey and estimate of cost of improving Bakers Bay, near the mouth of Columbia River, in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9541) authorizing the Secretary of War to sell the timber on the Three Tree Point Military Reservation in Wahkiakum County, State of Washington; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COADY: A bill (H. R. 9542) to amend the second paragraph of section 3264 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by section 5 of the act of March 1, 1879, and as further amended by the act of Congress approved June 22, 1910; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 9543) to acquire a site and erect a manufacturing plant for the manufacture of arms, ordnance, armor, and other military and naval appliances at Milwaukee, Wis.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 9544) providing for a further survey and examination of Absecon Inlet, Atlantic County, N. J.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9545) providing for a survey of Hereford Inlet, Cape May County, N. J.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 9546) to establish a fish hatchery and fish station in the fourth congressional district of Wisconsin; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 9547) authorizing the acceptance by the United States Government from the Kenesaw Memorial Association of Illinois of a proposed gift of land on the Kenesaw battle field in the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAHER: A bill (H. R. 9548) to regulate the wages of certain employees employed in or under the Navy and War Departments of the Government; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLAND: A bill (H. R. 9549) making an appropriation of \$15,000 to enable the Secretary of the Navy to cause the smiths' and other shop buildings of the Norfolk Navy Yard to be remodeled and properly ventilated; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WALKER: A bill (H. R. 9550) to provide for district courts of the United States at Brunswick, Ga.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DILL: A bill (H. R. 9551) granting to various States public lands for construction, repair, and maintenance of public roads; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BENNET: Resolution (H. Res. 100) requesting the Secretary of State to furnish certain information relative to misuse of the American flag; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAGGART: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 113) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the jurisdiction of courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAKER: Memorial from the Legislature of California for providing for proper care in public institutions of patients afflicted with tuberculosis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NOLAN: Memorial from the Legislature of California favoring the passage of legislation to provide Federal aid for indigent nonresident tuberculous patients cared for in hospitals which conform to the hygienic standard established by the United States Treasury Department; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 9552) granting an increase of pension to John P. Fullhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 9553) granting a pension to Sarah A. Eddy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 9554) granting an increase of pension to William Wildermuth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLACK: A bill (H. R. 9555) for the relief of the estate of Thomas N. Aaron; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9556) for the relief of the heirs of John Faulkner; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: A bill (H. R. 9557) granting an increase of pension to Adenah W. Rich; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURGESS: A bill (H. R. 9558) for the relief of the estate of Henry Merseburger; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 9559) granting an increase of pension to Anna E. Ritchey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY: A bill (H. R. 9560) granting an increase of pension to William Llewellyn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9561) granting a pension to Emaline Catherine Lindner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9562) granting an increase of pension to Edward R. Turnbach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9563) granting a pension to Lucy F. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9564) granting a pension to William Ringlaben; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9565) granting a pension to Barbara Boyle; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9566) granting an increase of pension to Peter Banks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9567) granting a pension to Margaret M. Dymond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9568) granting a pension to Richard Lewis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 9569) for the relief of George D. Biggs; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 9570) granting an increase of pension to Aaron Summers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9571) granting an increase of pension to Perry C. McIntosh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9572) granting an increase of pension to Daniel L. B. Downey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9573) granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. Galyan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9574) granting an increase of pension to Ephraim Whitson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9575) granting a pension to Benjamin J. Burris; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DANFORTH: A bill (H. R. 9576) granting an increase of pension to Gainham Ball; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 9577) granting an increase of pension to James Wildes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON: A bill (H. R. 9578) granting an increase of pension to John W. Wiley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9579) granting an increase of pension to William L. Alyea; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9580) granting an increase of pension to Oliver Shepherd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9581) granting an increase of pension to William Seal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9582) granting an increase of pension to George W. Fleenor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9583) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9584) granting an increase of pension to Christina Leibecke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9585) granting an increase of pension to Mary B. Lawless; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9586) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Ketcham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9587) granting an increase of pension to Robert C. Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9588) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Diggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9589) granting an increase of pension to John M. Dixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9590) granting an increase of pension to Lafayette Hand; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9591) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Pittman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9592) granting an increase of pension to William H. Banks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9593) granting a pension to Vance K. Stewart; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9594) granting an increase of pension to Lafayette F. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9595) granting an increase of pension to John Schmaly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9596) granting an increase of pension to Robert McGill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9597) granting an increase of pension to Mary McKee Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9598) granting a pension to Mary S. Zuck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9599) granting a pension to Martha E. Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9600) granting a pension to Elizabeth Broadhead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9601) granting a pension to Laura A. Cumback; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EAGLE: A bill (H. R. 9602) for the relief of the heir of C. A. Bellenger and the estate of David H. Armour; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9603) for the relief of the heirs of Andrew J. Tevis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FARR: A bill (H. R. 9604) granting a pension to Augusta M. Robins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9605) granting a pension to Edward Sweeney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9606) for the relief of the widow of William H. Thomas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 9607) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9608) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Metcalfe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 9609) granting an increase of pension to Nancy M. Gray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9610) granting a pension to Laura Luella Satterfield; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 9611) granting an increase of pension to James M. Fish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9612) granting an increase of pension to Joseph R. McKeever; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9613) granting an increase of pension to Peter A. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 9614) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Asher; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 9615) to reimburse certain Indians for labor done in building a schoolhouse at Queets River, Quinault Indian Reservation, in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KINCHELOE: A bill (H. R. 9616) granting an increase of pension to Josephine A. Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 9617) granting an increase of pension to William H. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 9618) granting restoration of pension to Carrie Farnham Godfrey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 9619) granting a pension to Eliza J. St. Clair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9620) granting a pension to Friederike Bauersfield; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: A bill (H. R. 9621) for the relief of J. W. Dellinger; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 9622) granting a pension to David R. Locke; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 9623) granting a pension to Charles E. Cowper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9624) granting a pension to Mary N. Seely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9625) granting a pension to George A. Dick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9626) granting a pension to Mary A. O'Donnell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9627) granting a pension to Ida Gilhooly; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OAKLEY: A bill (H. R. 9628) granting a pension to Catherine Sullivan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PORTER: A bill (H. R. 9629) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Bowers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9630) granting an increase of pension to Henry Peoples; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9631) granting an increase of pension to Ferdinand Opperman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9632) granting a pension to Elizabeth Denges; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9633) granting an increase of pension to John A. Donnelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9634) granting an increase of pension to John W. Hague; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POU: A bill (H. R. 9635) for the relief of the estate of Williamson Page; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PRATT: A bill (H. R. 9636) granting an increase of pension to John Heimroth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 9637) granting a pension to Elizabeth Neil; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9638) granting an increase of pension to Azariah Dennis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 9639) granting an increase of pension to John H. Admire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9640) to correct the military record of Robert W. Marr; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 9641) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte Poe; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: A bill (H. R. 9642) granting a pension to Ann M. Coady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9643) for the relief of William J. Coady; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHOUSE: A bill (H. R. 9644) authorizing the issuance of a patent to the northwest quarter section 27, township 17 south, range 40 west, Dodge City (Kans.) land district, to George H. Lowrey; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9645) granting an increase of pension to Uriah T. Tapscott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 9646) granting a pension to Samuel W. Gilliland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9647) for the relief of Aaron Kibler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 9648) granting an increase of pension to George Knapp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: A bill (H. R. 9649) granting a pension to Elizabeth Meyers, now Elizabeth Schwing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEDMAN: A bill (H. R. 9650) for the relief of the estate of John H. Breeze; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEELE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9651) granting permission to Lieut. Commander W. Pitt Scott, of the United States Navy, to accept and wear a decoration bestowed on him by the Sultan of Turkey; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9652) granting a pension to Phoebe A. Dixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 9653) granting a pension to Matthew J. Burke; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9654) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Batsford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 9655) for the relief of the heirs of Albert L. Berry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 9656) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Norman H. Watson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 9657) granting a pension to Frances W. Rumbolz; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of Roanoke (Va.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union, protesting against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of Manila Camp, No. 1, Spanish War Veterans, urging increase in pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also (by request), memorial of Los Angeles Branch National Security League, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of churches of Lebanon, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of 45 citizens of Coshocton and Mansfield, Ohio, protesting against an increased tax on beer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASWELL: Memorial of Glenmore Socialist Local, relative to plan to bring the war to a close; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. AYRES: Petition of Louis Gerties et al., citizens of Argonia, Kans., against revenue stamps on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of William I. Pearson, of Wichita, Kans., protesting against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BENNET: Petition of Piano Manufacturers of New York City and vicinity, favoring passage of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN of West Virginia: Petitions signed by residents of Portage County, Marathon County, Shawano County, Waupaca County, and Waushara County, of the eighth congressional district of Wisconsin, favoring the enactment into law of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petitions of R. S. Rutherford and Herman S. Rosenbaum of New York, favoring child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of Harlem Board of Commerce, protesting against any Federal tax on mortgages and real estate conveyances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of piano manufacturers of New York City and vicinity, favoring the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Theatrical Protective Union of New York, protesting against any additional tax on theaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES: Petitions of McCleary, Wallin & Crouse, of Amsterdam, N. Y., and the Gloversville Knitting Co. and E. S. Parkhurst & Co., of Gloversville, N. Y., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COPLEY: Papers to accompany House bill 9355, granting a pension to C. Jennie Stephens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COSTELLO: Petition of Penn Worsted Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURRY: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Sacramento, Cal., favoring an increase of one-half cent per pound in the tariff on lemons, oranges, grapefruit, limes, and pomelos; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DARROW: Petitions of Max Heinrici, of Germantown, and Rev. H. C. Schneider, of Roxborough, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring passage of bill to prevent exportation of arms, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of Flavell Bros., of Germantown; Corkran Bros., of Philadelphia; Bennett & Aspden Co., J. W. Barber & Co., and Jos. M. Adams & Co., of Manayunk, Philadelphia, Pa., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of Theatrical Protective Union of New York, protesting against tax on theaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Woman's Party of Cook County, Ill., favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of Piano Manufacturers of New York City and vicinity, favoring passage of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of A. D. Varian, favoring passage of House bill 476, workmen's compensation act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Aileen Didesan, of California, favoring workmen's compensation bill (H. R. 476); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEWALT: Petitions of sundry tradespeople of the thirteenth congressional district of Pennsylvania, favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DRUKKER: Petition of McCollom & Post, favoring passage of House bill 702, dyestuffs tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Baker & Schofield Co., favoring passage of House bill 702, dyestuffs tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Gautschi Silk Dyeing Co., Silk Dyers' Mutual Protective Association of America, Lanza Silk Dyeing Co., the Perfection Silk Dyeing Co., Wagaraw Silk Dyeing Co., Standard Silk Dyeing Co., Eli Mirandon, and C. De Grado, favoring passage of House bill 702, dyestuffs tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of James H. Farrar, favoring passage of House bill 702, dyestuffs tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of De Gise Silk Dyeing Co., favoring passage of House bill 702, dyestuffs tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of H. H. Brown & Sons Co., favoring passage of House bill 702, dyestuffs tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of Pacific Fisheries Society, relative to aid for commercial fisheries of the Pacific coast; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Traffic Club of New York, favoring repeal of the seamen's act; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ESCH: Petitions of John Thompson and 27 others, of Colby, and Hubert Hochmuth and 25 others, of Lasalle, Wis., urging passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ELSTON: Memorial of San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, favoring legislation for California-Oregon interests; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of California Cotton Mills Co., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of Theatrical Protective Association of New York, protesting against tax on theaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Iron Shipbuilders' Cooperative Association and Drillers and Tappers League, relative to more pay for workmen in Brooklyn Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of piano manufacturers of New York City and vicinity, favoring passage of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of New York Post Office Laborers' Benevolent Association, Branch No. 1, relative to classification for post-office laborers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Burson Knitting Co., of Rockford, Ill., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEATON: Petition of John P. Ryan, of Pottsville, Pa., relative to national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HINDS: Petition of Cabot Manufacturing Co., of Brunswick, Me., favoring passage of bill to protect manufacturers of dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON: Petition of Woman's Home and Foreign Missionary Societies of the Bethany Presbyterian Church, of Trenton, N. J., favoring censorship for motion-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petitions of F. A. Strauss & Co. and Crescent Insulate Wire & Cable Co., of Trenton, N. J., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: Petition of citizens of Low Moor, Davenport, Lost Nation, Wheatland, Calamus, Grand Mound, Conesville, Nichols, Lone Tree, Baldwin, Monmouth, Maquoketa, Charlotte, Goose Lake, Bryant, Sabula, Miles, Delmar, Preston, Dewitt, Welton, Le Claire, Bettendorf, Atalissa, Wilton Junction, Clin-

ton, Walcott, Solon, Iowa City, West Liberty, Dixon, Eldridge, Long Grove, Lyons, Princeton, Camanche, Muscatine, Victor, Ladora, Oxford, Parnell, North English, Williamsburg, Marengo, and others of the second district of Iowa, asking that tax be sage of bill to prohibit exportation of munitions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petitions of Wolff Worsted Mills and Stillwater Worsted Mills, of Harrisville, and Narrow Fabric Co., of Pawtucket, R. I., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of citizens of the State of Minnesota, urging legislation requiring mail-order houses to pay taxes in sections where they dispose of goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOUD: Papers to accompany bill for pension for Carrie Farnham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHER: Petition of piano manufacturers of New York City and vicinity, favoring passage of Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of women of 76 chapters of the Daughters of the American Revolution, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of William H. Hubbell Camp, No. 4, Department of New York, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring pensions for widows; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Jennings Lace Works, favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petitions of William H. Richardson and others, Standard Waste Manufacturing Co., Goodman Bros. & Hinlim, John Hamilton & Sons, Pine Tree Silk Mills Co., William Brown & Co., Hancock Knitting Mills, all of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORIN (by request): Petition of citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Citizens Committee for Food Shipments, relative to refusal of France to allow shipments of condensed milk; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Comision Reguladora del Mercado de Henequen, relative to investigation of harvester combine in Yucatan, Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Workmen's Circle, favoring resolution offering mediation to belligerents; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: Papers to accompany House bill 9185, granting a pension to Martha A. Knapp; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 9186, for the relief of George W. Davis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Southbridge Printing Co., in favor of House bill 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Rockwell Woolen Co., of Leominster, Mass., in favor of House bill 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Edwin Bartlett Co., of North Oxford, Mass., indorsing House bill 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Perry Yarn Mills, of Webster, Mass., indorsing House bill 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Naquoy Worsted Mills, of West Rutland, Mass., favoring House bill 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POWERS: Papers to accompany House bill 9390, granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Sexton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of Henry P. Horton, president Associated Charities of Ithaca, N. Y., favoring passage of the Keating child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SANFORD: Petition relative to House bill 702, a bill to provide revenue for the Government and to establish and maintain the manufacture of dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Protest of members of Rice Creek Grange, No. 1470, against increasing the appropriation for a larger Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Michigan Carton Co. and Standard Paper Co., of Kalamazoo, Mich., favoring legislation to make the United States independent of any other nation for its dyestuffs; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper from George E. Dean, Albion, Mich., favoring establishment of a nonpartisan tariff board; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 5591, for relief of Florence Monroe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Petitions of H. A. Witthoft and others, of Pocatello; J. A. Schlichting and others, of Twin Falls; and Andrew Huber and other citizens, all of Idaho, favoring passage of bill to prohibit exportation of munitions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 7409, to increase the pension of Alexander Morrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Hon. Theodore Turner, of Pocatello, Idaho, and 96 others, urging legislation providing for the relief of the unemployed; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Levi Slinker and 195 citizens of Canyon County, Idaho, protesting against law restricting use of the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Sandpoint, Idaho, urging legislation providing a world federation with the view of bringing to a close the war in Europe and secure perpetual peace throughout the civilized world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: Papers to accompany H. R. 8769, a bill for the relief of the heirs of James S. Rollins; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Memorial of Orange Grove Monthly Meeting of Friends, of Pasadena, Cal., protesting against any increase of armament for war purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Los Angeles Branch of National Security League, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Church of the People, of Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against any increase of armaments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEELE of Pennsylvania: Petitions of Easton Finishing Co. and Stewart Silk Co., of Easton, Pa., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TREADWAY: Petitions of citizens of first congressional district of Massachusetts, favoring passage of bill taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Byron, Weston & Co., of Dalton; Crocker, McElwain & Co., Chemical Paper Manufacturing Co., and American Writing Paper Co., of Holyoke, Mass., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, January 21, 1916.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Joseph H. Crocker, D. D., of Boston, Mass., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God our Father, we worship Thee as the Maker of heaven and earth. We praise Thee as the Creator of all tribes and peoples. We honor Thee as the Ruler of all nations. We thank Thee most gratefully for all the gracious blessings of our daily life. And now, as Representatives of this great Nation here assembled in Congress, we ask for the guidance of Thy spirit, even the spirit of Jesus Christ, that we may enact wise laws; that we may promote and protect the sacred privileges of our glorious country; and that we do something to establish justice more firmly throughout the world. And unto Thy great and high and glorious name we give honor, glory, and thanksgiving, now and forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEES.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces the resignation of a member of a committee. The Clerk will report it:

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS,
Washington, January 20, 1916.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am unable to attend to the duties as member of the Claims Committee. As chairman of the Pensions Committee I am overwhelmed with work, with a large personal correspondence besides, and I shall have to resign as a member of the Claims Committee, owing to the fact that I can not do justice to that committee.

I trust my place will be filled and my resignation accepted without delay.

Very sincerely, yours,

ISAAC R. SHERWOOD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.